

James Thomas Coleman, Livingston, Tex., in place of J. T. Coleman. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1942.

Joe H. Victory, New Willard, Tex., in place of J. H. Victory. Incumbent's commission expired November 27, 1941.

Laura A. Bruening, Westhoff, Tex., in place of L. A. Bruening. Incumbent's commission expired November 27, 1941.

VERMONT

Murray K. Paris Lyndon, Vt., in place of M. K. Paris. Incumbent's commission expired November 30, 1941.

Adelbert G. Dudley, Shoreham, Vt., in place of A. G. Dudley. Incumbent's commission expired November 30, 1941.

VIRGINIA

Ireland M. Baker, Haysi, Va., in place of I. M. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired December 1, 1941.

Ruth H. Underwood, Meadows of Dan, Va., in place of R. H. Underwood. Incumbent's commission expired December 1, 1941.

Edna E. Dudley Turner, West Graham, Va., in place of E. E. D. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired December 1, 1941.

WASHINGTON

Henning E. Johnson, Du Pont, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1939.

WEST VIRGINIA

Queenie V. Keagy, Bruceton Mills, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

John Speicher, Hopemont, W. Va., in place of John Speicher. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.

Herbert A. Frazier, Winfield, W. Va., in place of H. A. Frazier. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

WISCONSIN

Mildred M. Dwyer, East Troy, Wis., in place of J. F. Clancy, resigned.

Ludy J. Drolson, Lake Nebagamon, Wis., in place of L. J. Drolson. Incumbent's commission expired November 30, 1941.

WYOMING

Richard M. Turner, Frontier, Wyo., in place of R. M. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1941.

Oscar W. Dahlquist, Mountainview, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 24 (legislative day of March 5), 1942:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Frank J. Duffy to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz.

POSTMASTER

Albert A. Stebbins, Garber, Okla.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS

John Warren O'Donnell
Stephen John Lange
Fred L. Wommack

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

TO BE A VICE ADMIRAL FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Russell R. Waesche

TO BE REAR ADMIRALS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Stanley V. Parker
Edward D. Jones

TO BE A LIEUTENANT

Randolph Ridgely 3d

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS

Jean H. Hawley Jack Senior
Frederick B. T. Sjems Raymond P. Eyman
Kenneth T. Adams Charles Shaw
Frederic L. Peacock Carl A. Egner
Ray L. Schoppe Edgar H. Bernstein

Ronald R. Moore
John A. Bond
Cornelius D. Meaney
Augustus P. Ratti
Earl O. Heaton
William M. Scaife
Robert F. A. Studds
Henry C. Warwick
Benjamin H. Rigg
Ralph W. Woodworth
Leo C. Wilder
Albert J. Hoskinson
Elliott B. Roberts
Henry E. Finnegan
Charles M. Thomas
Charles Pierce
Thomas B. Reed
Jack C. Sammons
Robert W. Knox
H. Arnold Karo
George L. Anderson
Isidor E. Rittenburg
Kenneth G. Crosby
Glendon E. Boothe
Earle A. Deily
Leonard S. Hubbard
Philip C. Doran
John C. Eose
Hubert A. Paton
Walter H. Bainbridge
Carl I. Aslakson
Riley J. Sipe
Samuel B. Grenell
Paul A. Smith
Ira T. Sanders
Edward R. McCarthy
Francis B. Quinn
Emil H. Kirsch
Henry J. Healy
John H. Brittain
Walter J. Chovan
George A. Nelson
Wilbur R. Porter
Clarence A. Burmister
Percy L. Bernstein
James D. Thurmond
Charles A. Schanck
Joseph P. Lushene
Curtis LeFever
Henry O. Fortin

TO BE JUNIOR HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS

Charles A. Schoene Dale E. Sturmer
William R. Tucker Fair J. Bryant
Philip A. Weber Charles W. Clark
William N. Martin Joseph W. Stirni
Harold J. Seaborg Glen W. Moore

TO BE AIDES

Edward G. Cunney V. Ralph Sobleralski
Robert H. Randall, Jr. Raymond M. Stone.
G. Albion Smith Lorin F. Woodcock

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. George F. Kettell, D. D., pastor of St. Mary's Church and past national chaplain of the American Legion, Rochester, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, who hast said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there shall I be in the midst of them," we dedicate this assemblage to Thy honor and glory and convene it in Thy name.

Here are gathered together the Representatives of the people of a great Nation which Thou hast founded as a haven for all liberty-loving peoples. Here is exercised the authority to rule which has come from Thee through Thy people to

this body; theirs it is to give us under Thee, O God, life, liberty, and happiness.

O God, we humbly ask Thee to dwell in the midst of this legislative body; inspire them with Thy counsels; shower upon them Thy holy grace that they may proceed with patience, wisdom, courage, and unselfishness; that they prove to be a mighty bulwark of true godly Americanism against which the storms of tyranny, cruelty, selfishness, and ungodliness may dash in vain, and behind which bulwark the government of the people, by the people, and for the people will never perish from the earth.

If there ever was a time in our history when we—Government and people—needed to sincerely evoke from our hearts the soul-stirring refrain of our fathers, "In God we trust," it is now. War clouds darken our vision; the powers of evil have been loosed against us; mighty war machines threaten to encompass us and beat us flat to the ground; threaten to ravish our altars, our homes, and our hearth fires; threaten to destroy the God-given principles of liberty, justice, and humanity which we were founded by God to protect. Again as of old with the apostles of Christ we cry out, "Lord save us, we perish," and with our fathers we repeat, "In God is our trust."

O God, we humbly beseech Thee to bless our Government and our people. Pray for us as Thou didst for Thy apostles in the garden of sorrow that we—Government and people—may be one, as Thou and Thy Heavenly Father are one; unity of leaders and people founded on loyalty, courage, and sacrifice; a people ready to hold up the wearying arms of our representatives carrying the torch of liberty 'til the battle with the Philistines is won; leaders ready to subordinate all personal political considerations, working and sacrificing to one end and one end only, that victory and a peace of justice may once again add a lustrous halo to our beloved flag—our Star-Spangled Banner.

May God bless America forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6738. An act to limit the initial base pay of \$21 per month for enlisted men in the Army and Marine Corps to those of the seventh grade; and

H. R. 6759. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended, so as to permit payment for overtime for Saturday service in lieu of compensatory time.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4665. An act for the relief of Harry Kahn; and

H. R. 5473. An act for the relief of Allene Ruhiman and John P. Ruhiman.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials from the Chicago Sun, one on freedom of the press and the other on new labor bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MANSFIELD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE 40-HOUR-WEEK DISPUTE

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to read a letter with respect to the 40-hour-week controversy. The letter is from Ralph E. Flanders, president of the New England Council, Statler Building, Boston, Mass. It reads as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: It may be helpful in reaching an amicable conclusion regarding the 40-hour week and overtime if a formula is adopted which provides time and a half for all work performed on the sixth consecutive day, and double time for the seventh consecutive day, regardless of the days on which these occur. It then does not matter on which weekday the worker begins his shift schedule.

This progressive increase acts as a brake on excessive overtime costs and overfatigue. I offer this as a suggestion.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. FLANDERS, President.

Mr. Flanders, president of the New England Council, is one of the leading manufacturers in the northeastern part of the country. He is a prominent Vermont Republican, who has long been keenly interested in the public affairs of his State, of New England, and of the Nation. His unselfish devotion to the common good, combined with his great experience as a manufacturer and an employer of many men, gives an unusual significance to his suggestion for the settlement of the present 40-hour-week dispute.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. YOUNG addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the statement just made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] with reference to the 40-hour week, I would like to take occasion in commenting on that to advise the House that on yesterday I introduced a bill that would meet the very suggestion that the gentleman made about the 40-hour week.

I would also like to call attention to the fact that that bill contains three other provisions, one of which would outlaw strikes by making those who strike in defense or wartime industries amenable to draft service immediately, and the bill also would make it unlawful to conspire to bring about a strike and would limit war profits.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by the Honorable Paul V. McNutt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request made by the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED RECESS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I understand a program is outlined by some with reference to an Easter

recess of 2 weeks, and while I am always glad to cooperate with our distinguished floor leader, I want to give notice now that so far as I am concerned, as one Member of the House, I shall oppose and vote against and do everything I can to prevent any recess or any adjournment until Congress passes legislation with reference to the slow-down of production in our munition plants.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, one to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and the other to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, our chaplain this morning made a fervent prayer. We thank him for his prayer, especially at this time, for we sorely need guidance, here and in the entire Nation. In my home town on Sunday a bomb or pineapple was planted on the porch of a labor leader. You would think that our people today would use their pineapples for the Japanese. When you read about a concern in my home town, the Jack & Heintz Co., receiving \$600 from the Navy Department for a piece of equipment which cost about \$270 to produce, you can appreciate that we need to be prayed for in America today.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman means in Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Yes; Ohio, New York, Illinois—every State, and Mississippi in particular.

We are grateful to the Naval Affairs Committee of the House for turning the searchlight on the nefarious practices of those who are impeding the war effort.

PROPOSED RECESS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the reading of last night's newspaper provided at least three items of news which should give us serious cause for thought.

The first was the report that a Mr. William Jack, of Bedford, Ohio, has received an increase in salary and bonuses of over \$100,000 last year over what he received the year before and that he paid his secretary \$39,000. Mr. Jack's firm is engaged in making war supplies, Mr. Speaker, so these fabulous salaries were paid out of the pockets of the taxpayers while their boys shoulder arms at \$21 per month.

The second story reported labor disputes and work stoppages and pointed out how much less than 24 hours a day the production lines of America are actually working.

The third item stated it was planned for Congress to take a 2-week recess starting next Monday. Mr. Speaker, I submit that in justice to the boys of Bataan and the rest of our armed forces Congress should stay steadily in session until we have done whatever it is necessary to do to get full 24-hour production

going in every shop and factory of America and to stop unconscionable war profiteering wherever it is taking place, by either labor leaders or industrialists. I realize that many Members would like to get home because of impending primary elections. In that respect I am no different from the rest as I have a primary opponent who is campaigning against me day and night as is his right. I, too, would like to be home to correct misrepresentations and do some campaigning of my own but in times like these, politics, privilege, and profits must give way so that America can be on with the job of winning this war.

America will survive whether any of us return to Congress or not but America will not succeed unless we make it possible to produce weapons needed by our boys, so they can change retreat into victory. Congress must not recess now. We must not make the mistake Nero made when he chose the wrong period of Roman history in which to do his fiddling.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PROPOSED RECESS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, others have already expressed their feeling that we should not recess until we have taken action on the pending proposals to speed up production and limit profits. There is now pending in the Committee on Naval Affairs legislation which I think is of vital importance to the people of the United States. I refer to the Vinson bill, and to the companion Smith bill, which I understand is before the Committee on Military Affairs. I do not think this House should recess for one single day until we have acted upon that legislation. Those bills are, in my opinion, of vital importance to the Nation. We owe it to our armed forces to put a stop to any unconscionable profits on defense work. We owe it to America to have done with the racket of charging American citizens for the right to work on Government jobs. We owe it to the free people of the world to see to it that our industry runs 24 hours per day.

I know that there are Members who think that if we would go home and talk with the people it would cause us to more readily vote for this legislation. Others seem to think that such a visit would have exactly the opposite effect. I think it is always well for Representatives to visit with the people they represent just as often as possible. It makes for better and more representative government. I have no fear of the result of a visit with the people on the outcome of the vote on this legislation. Under ordinary circumstances I might go along with those who want to recess to give an opportunity for contact with the people. But, these are not ordinary times. We need action.

Some of us have tried to show this House the necessity for action for many months. At last I believe that a majority agrees we should act. Let us, therefore, stay here on the job until we have taken action.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am in sympathy with what the gentleman says, but we are told that this committee cannot possibly get this bill in here for 10 days or 2 weeks. What is the gentleman going to do in the meantime?

Mr. POAGE. I do not know why the committee cannot get it in next week with all ease. They have had all this week and a good part of last week. The committee can have a bill in here next week, and it should have.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the influence of labor unions starts to rise as a result of excesses on the part of employers. The influence of labor unions starts to decline as a result of excesses on the part of walking delegates. At the present time the influence of labor unions in this country has dropped tremendously and is still dropping, because of the excesses of the walking delegates. I am not so sure but that it would be better for the walking delegates to be given 2 weeks more of rope and have the Members of the House and Senate go home and find out how the people feel and what the actual situation is that the walking delegates have created. It is a menace to America and it is a menace to the workingmen of America.

COMPENSATION OF GOVERNMENT WORKERS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to enter into the merits of the controversy that is revolving around Mr. Guthrie, who lately retired from the Office of War Production. I do want to point out that on principle Mr. Guthrie is correct in that Mr. Nelson should have under him people who are working for the Government who derive their entire compensation from the Government, and not from any other source. I have said that before and still believe it. I am not shooting at any individual. But if they are determining governmental policy, I think they ought to be governmental employees, and on no other pay roll.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If the gentleman will investigate the income-tax returns, he will find that many of the multimillionaires of the last 20 years were dollar-a-year men in the last war. I agree with the gentleman from California thoroughly; these men ought to

draw their compensations entirely from the Government, and not be obligated to someone else.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I refer the gentleman to H. R. 6443, a bill I introduced long ago that would forbid anyone to hold one of these positions and remain on any private corporation or organization pay roll. And I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution from my home town, Concordia, Kans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously serious when I say that before we can whip Hitler in Berlin and the Japs in Tokyo, we at least have to dehorn Phil Murray in Washington, D. C. It does not make any difference whether we go home for 2 weeks or not. I am arranging meetings for the next 2 weeks in my district, to let the people tell me just how they feel about all these things. We can go home and stay 2 weeks or 4 weeks and it will not make any difference. There is only one man in this Nation who stands between the Smith bill and its success. Until he changes his mind nothing can be done, because he controls Congress. From that second ledge behind me I heard him say to us once:

Don't be an ostrich; don't hide your head in the sand.

Now it is his turn.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and print therein an article from the Florida Catholic, the official newspaper of the diocese of St. Augustine, Fla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to several Members of this body voice objection to the adjournment of Congress until we will have passed legislation eliminating certain statutes which are interfering with war production. I do not agree with them. I want this Congress to recess for 2 or 3 weeks. I want every Member to go home and

talk to his people as I have recently talked with mine, because, if they do go home and do talk to their people, they will come back here and repeal all of that legislation with such speed and positiveness that, in comparison, the bat of an eye would seem like slow motion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, personally it makes no difference to me whatsoever whether we take a 2 weeks' recess or not, but anybody who has heard the 1-minute speeches yesterday and today might well come to the conclusion, if they noticed the heat with which various Members have spoken, that perhaps a cooling-off period of about 2 weeks might do the Members of Congress a little bit of good. So I suggest that if we do not recess, we at least try to keep cool and not pass any legislation hurriedly and under pressure of what I think is hysteria.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from a mother in my district, which for its simplicity and forcefulness is to my mind a fine classic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad at least to see that we are getting some recruits to fight for those principles that some of us have been fighting for on this floor during the past 2 or 3 years. I think we can now say we were justified in the things we said in the Well of this House.

However, I did not rise for that purpose. I rose for the purpose of saying that I have an answer to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] who took us from the State of California to task because we had the temerity to ask for protection and we had the temerity to ask if we still have State rights and the right to pass our own laws with reference to State taxes.

I hope the Members of this House will read the reply I am going to put in the RECORD to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement I made before the Ways and Means Committee this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABOR AND PROFITS LEGISLATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise in the House for the purpose only of occupying 1 minute in addressing my colleagues. I would not do it on this occasion if I did not feel deeply about the vital need for prompt action being taken against those persons and firms who are apparently reaping huge returns from war contracts.

On December 4, 1941, the day following our vote on the so-called antistrike legislation in this House I pleaded in this Well that we carry on with the program of stopping racketeering, not only in labor's ranks, but also in the ranks of employers as well. I contended then that our vote of December 3d should be followed very quickly by legislative action in this body against profit patriots and defense brokers who are using the war effort to further selfish gains.

I have been amazed at the testimony given before the House Naval Affairs Committee in relation to the unwarranted contracts for materials going into the prosecution of the war. Gentlemen, we cannot delay longer in this responsibility. These culprits of corruption in management must be driven from our industrial system.

[Here the gavel fell.]

RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we are going to take a couple of weeks off or not. I know one thing, however. If I live and do well, I expect to get off some way and go down to see my folks for a few days and shake hands with them regardless of whether the rest of you go or not. I want to know what the people I represent are talking about. Somebody may be blaming me with the responsibility of passing that thing they call the Congress pension act. I cannot let that go. You know I did not vote for it, and it was no pension if I had.

Now, I am not going to get up here, a member of one committee, and tell you how quickly another committee should get legislation out on the floor; that is its responsibility. If they need to take some more time to study it, I am not going to assume to state they cannot have it. Those who talk the other way are not fooling anybody but themselves. They feel just like I do, too; they are not kidding anybody.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a news item and a portion of a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LONGEVITY PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R.

1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the Bill (H. R. 1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "as a reward for continuous service heretofore rendered or to be rendered hereafter, shall be granted \$84 per annum in addition to their base pay as now or hereafter fixed by law upon completion of ten years' service; and an additional \$60 per annum upon the completion of an additional five-year period of service thereafter: Provided, That no credit shall be given for service after the fifteenth year of employment: Provided further, That in computing an employee's length of service, credit shall be given for substitute service"; and the Senate agree to the same.

M. A. ROMJUE,
T. G. BURCH,
FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
N. M. MASON,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
JAS. M. MEAD,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JAMES J. DAVIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House conferees agreed to Senate amendment 1 to strike out of page 1, line 3, postmasters of the third and fourth classes. It was then agreed to accept the House language pertaining to the longevity provisions of the bill with the exception of the amounts to be added to the base pay of employees at the end of ten and fifteen years service; those amounts were agreed upon as \$84 per annum at the end of ten years continuous service and an additional \$60 per annum upon the completion of an additional five-year period of service thereafter.

The effective date of the act was fixed as July 1, 1942, the date carried in the bill as reported to and passed by the House July 23, 1941.

M. A. ROMJUE,
T. G. BURCH,
FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
N. M. MASON,

Members on the part of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. There have been a lot of inquiries concerning this conference report. While the statement is quite adequate, I wish the gentleman would state the reduction made in the Senate bill over that in the House bill, for there is quite a reduction.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield for that purpose to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when the House passed this longevity pay bill by an overwhelming vote it carried two increments: One of \$100 a year and a second increment of an additional \$100 a year after 5 more years of service. The Senate reduced these increments each to \$60 per year. In the conference it was agreed that the House should recede on its first increment of \$100 a year and accept \$84, which is \$7 per month. The House receded. On the second increment the conference committee agreed on the Senate provision of \$60 per year.

Third- and fourth-class postmasters were also cut out of the benefits of the bill by the conference committee.

These are the main changes. The bill now carries a considerable deduction over the House bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Why were third- and fourth-class postmasters eliminated? I have received a lot of letters from third- and fourth-class postmasters complaining that they were eliminated from the bill, and they want to know why.

Mr. MASON. The elimination was because of the fact their inclusion would mean an additional amount of money; and it was also very difficult to figure how longevity pay could be applied to them. The entire proposition was taken out.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield.

Mr. TABER. This bill passed the House, of course, before Pearl Harbor. Does the gentleman believe the general public is going to be happy about bills carrying increases in compensation to employees of the Government?

Mr. MASON. Yes; I do if that increase is justified; and I consider this probably the most justifiable increase we could give to this class of Government employees. Certainly it is more justifiable than any straight increase in pay because it establishes the longevity principle, which is one of the soundest and sanest principles to be adopted in any employment policy.

Mr. TABER. This, as I understand, will call for an increase of about \$9,000,000 a year.

Mr. MASON. Approximately; yes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will ask the gentleman right there if it does not run closer to \$12,000,000 a year?

Mr. MASON. It may, because we have cut out the third- and fourth-class postmasters. We have reduced it, but we do not know how much.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The Post Office Department, about 10 years ago, increased the first-class postal rates from 2 cents to 3 cents, giving the Post Office Department \$100,000,000 additional revenue. Then you made various changes in your laws, increasing the salaries of everybody in the Postal Service. You have used up the \$100,000,000, and last year you were \$40,000,000 in the red. How are you going to raise that money? Will you put on additional revenue for the Post Office Department to take care of the deficit as well as the amount you are going to pay extra here so that the Post Office Department will not draw on the Federal Treasury but will pay its own way?

Mr. ROMJUE. I may say to the gentleman that his statement does not in any way attach itself to this legislation. The statement he has made about increasing the salaries of postal employees is not correct. I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. But the Post Office Department is in the red at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like the gentleman to state a little bit more the reason why third- and fourth-class postmasters were left out of this bill.

Mr. BURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BURCH. The conferees considered that matter for sometime, and I may say we were in and out on it. We finally reached the conclusion, in addition to what the gentleman from Illinois has said, that the postmasters were in a different class or in a different group from the regular employees of the Postal Service and if we included the third- and fourth-class postmasters and not first- and second-class postmasters it is very probable that it would be considered discriminatory. May I say to the gentleman further that this House has passed a bill that is very helpful to the fourth-class postmasters. It is much more beneficial than this would be. That bill is now in the Senate and I notice that Senator McKellar has stated it is probable the bill will be passed by the Senate, perhaps with some amendments, in a short time. I am hoping that legislation will come through that will take care of the fourth-class postmasters to a great extent. As to the third class we might consider some amendment.

Mr. FORAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. Considerable confusion seems to have arisen from the wording of the amendment. A great many of the post-office employees have asked me for a clarification of it. I have spoken to the conferees and I am informed it is the intent of this legislation that men with 10 years' service will get the \$84, then will have to wait 5 years to get the additional \$60. Men with 15

years' service would automatically get \$144.

Mr. ROMJUE. That is correct.

Mr. FORAND. It is feared that the Comptroller General may misinterpret the intent of this amendment.

Mr. ROMJUE. We have discussed that with the Post Office Department and their legal authorities think they will get their \$84 after the first 10 years and in the next 5 years they will get \$60 additional, plus the \$84.

Mr. FORAND. Those men who have already 15 years' service will get the two instead of having to wait 5 years to get the second increment.

Mr. ROMJUE. That is correct.

Mr. BURCH. All who have served 10 years but not to exceed 15 years get \$84 annually. All who have served 15 years will get \$144.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Will the gentleman tell us this: Does it include all postal employees—railway mail clerks, rural route men, and city carriers?

Mr. ROMJUE. All who deal with the mail. I may say to the gentleman that since this bill was passed by the House the Pearl Harbor incident has occurred. Since we have gotten into the war and up to January 1 over a thousand men out of the Postal Service, expert postal men, have gone into the Army or Navy—in other words, have gone into the service. This recent draft will take out from twelve to fifteen thousand experienced men from the Postal Service. Of course, the mail is piling up.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It includes substantially everybody in the Service then except the third- and fourth-class postmasters?

Mr. ROMJUE. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that the postal employees have not had an increase in pay since 1924? The argument has been offered that this bill was introduced before Pearl Harbor. Is it not further a fact that the cost of living in some of these cities has gone up anywhere from 9 to 15 percent since Pearl Harbor? Is it not a fact, further, that this branch of the service represents regular employees, not extra employees, and that they deserve this consideration at the hands of Congress?

Mr. ROMJUE. Yes; and I may say also that this legislation was passed for the purpose of establishing the longevity principle.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. There seems to be some misunderstanding about postmasters. Postmasters are not affected at all by this bill, are they?

Mr. ROMJUE. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. This bill deals entirely with the personnel working in the post offices?

Mr. ROMJUE. That is right; the employees handling mail.

Mr. MICHENER. It deals with the longevity service, and it will be an incentive to keep in the Department the men who are now leaving the Department because of higher wages in industry. Is that true?

Mr. ROMJUE. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. Something has been said about the increasing cost of living. The gentleman from Ohio referred to an increase of 15 percent. I may say that in Detroit it has increased 20 percent, I am advised. Many of our postal employees, naturally, are thinking about going into industry, where they may receive higher wages. I think we ought to do what we can to keep those men in the Postal Service.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Can the gentleman from Missouri tell me what is the content and intent of the bill pending in the Senate relative to fourth-class postmasters?

Mr. ROMJUE. I have forgotten just who introduced that bill.

Mr. BURCH. If the gentleman will yield, I may say that the fourth-class postmasters are now on cancellation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. BURCH. The bill passed by this House and now in the Senate puts the postmasters of the fourth class on a salary basis.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will their income be larger than it is at the present time?

Mr. BURCH. Yes. As an illustration, the average postmaster earning, say from \$400 to \$450, would have a salary of \$572; those receiving from \$450 to \$500 would get \$608; those receiving from \$500 to \$600 would get \$684; and it continues along at that rate.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The fourth-class postmasters are probably the lowest-paid employees in the Federal service.

Mr. BURCH. May I call attention to one other matter in regard to the postal employees? In the last week we passed a bill in this House—and it is agreeable to the postal employees—by which they go on a 48-hour week without overtime pay.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. The bill referred to by the gentleman from Ohio I do not believe in the final analysis will cost the Post Office Department an additional penny, because it will eliminate much of the unnecessary work now performed in auditing and computing the compensation to which the fourth-class postmaster is entitled. The present system is a very complicated method and very unsatisfactory. I believe the passage of the bill now pending in the Senate, and which was passed by this House, will be very helpful and not cause any additional expense to the Department.

Mr. MICHENER. These postal employees, as suggested by the gentleman from Virginia just a moment ago, will go on a 48-hour week. You are not increasing the pay for the 48-hour week. If what the gentleman says is correct, these employees are going on a 48-hour week. We are hearing lots about 40-hour and 48-hour weeks. When those employees accept a 48-hour week, I think we ought to think twice before we act too hastily on some of these bills.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. I understand that the words "for continuous service heretofore rendered" apply to the increase for the 15-year bracket as well as the 10-year bracket, so that a man who has had 15 years of continuous service at the time this bill takes effect would get the \$144 per annum increase. Is not that the intent of this language?

Mr. ROMJUE. I believe that is right.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. I understand that was the intent of the committee.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. The gentleman speaks about a thousand men going into the military or naval service of the country. If those men are in the service let us say for a year or 2 years, is the period of that service to be added onto the 10 years they may have served up to this time in the Postal Service?

Mr. ROMJUE. I do not think they will lose anything by being in the military service.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is not what I am asking. I am asking, are they going to get credit for those 2 years on the 10 years they have already been in the service? If not, they ought to get it, in my judgment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I correctly understand that this does not apply to any postmasters? But only to other postal employees?

Mr. ROMJUE. That is right.

Mr. MURDOCK. It applies to the employees in the first- and second-class offices?

Mr. ROMJUE. That is right.

Mr. MURDOCK. But not the third- and fourth-class offices. I think it unfortunate that all employees could not be included, and included on the more generous terms as the bill included before Pearl Harbor, but even this is fairly good as the beginning of longevity pay.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I believe the situation in regard to the question asked by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] was not made entirely clear. As I understood the question asked by the gentleman from Wisconsin, it covered

this sort of a condition: A postal employee goes into the service. A substitute takes his place and, if I correctly understand the postal regulations, becomes a regular. When the former employee returns from the military service, he goes back into the Postal Service.

Mr. ROMJUE. That is right.

Mr. PATRICK. What happens as far as the 2 years that employee was in the military service is concerned? Is that counted as a part of his Postal Service?

Mr. ROMJUE. I doubt if that is involved in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With the gentleman's permission, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia this question: In the bill recently passed that provides for a 48-hour week, is it not true that provision is made for payment of overtime in excess of 48 hours?

Mr. BURCH. It provides for regular pay.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It provides for regular straight pay. I want to understand that. It does not provide for overtime pay in excess of 48 hours.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 80, noes 6.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1935), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RICH reserved all points of order against the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate may be equally divided between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and myself.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, general debate will continue for today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think it will depend altogether on how many Members ask for time. On this side of the House we have not received very many requests for time, and I was hopeful we might conclude general debate within the next 2 or 2½ hours and actually start reading the bill for amendment.

Mr. RICH. I have a good many requests for time, and I would suggest that we continue with general debate for a while.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATION FOR DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] has just released to the press the most unwarranted attack that has ever come to my notice in my long service here upon a committee of this House. The language of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] is such that I know, beyond a shadow of doubt, that I could rise to a question of personal privilege and be recognized for that purpose if I so desired, but I am not going to avail myself of that privilege.

The gentleman accuses the Committee on Accounts of refusing to appropriate additional money for the Dies committee.

I want to say to the Members of the House that immediately following the passage of the resolution extending the life of the Dies committee, I called a meeting of the Accounts Committee, and I endeavored to get in touch with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. I could not find him. I was told at his office that he was around the city somewhere. Finally, after 2 days, I was advised by his secretary he had gone to Texas. I thereupon called the meeting off.

The Accounts Committee is not going to consider the resolution appropriating money to carry on the activities of the Dies committee in the absence of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], unless the gentleman is sick or advises me he cannot appear in person.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] says they have little money. There was \$6,000 to the credit of the Dies committee this morning which shows the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] does not know what he is talking about.

After accusing the administration of bleeding the Dies committee to death, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] said this is—

a situation highly gratifying to the Communist Party and the various Nazi and Fascist organizations that were unsuccessful in blocking the continuation of the committee on the floor of the House.

And he then accuses the administration of deliberately moving to cut off the committee's funds. He continues by saying that the latest attack is the most insidious and successful attempt to date to throttle the committee, made at a time when there has never been a greater need for its existence.

The gentleman from New Jersey talks at random, and as chairman of the Committee on Accounts permit me to say that no member of this administration has ever approached me with any such a suggestion. As I have repeatedly stated, the Accounts Committee is an agent of the House and when the House provides for a select committee it is the duty of the Accounts Committee to appropriate money so that it can carry out the duties imposed upon it.

The Accounts Committee has always made it a policy, especially where the time of a select committee has been extended, to require the chairman and members of the committee to justify their demand for an appropriation. That policy will be followed in connection with the Dies committee.

As those who have followed the activities of the Dies committee know, the Congress has appropriated \$385,000 during its life, which is more than has ever been appropriated for a select committee in its history. The Accounts Committee will, when the chairman of the Dies committee and the members of the committee justify an additional appropriation, bring in the proper resolution for that purpose, and not before.

I say to the gentleman from New Jersey the members of the Accounts Committee are not of that type who listen, as he says, to Fascists, Nazis, or members of the Communist Party.

On behalf of the committee, I resent the attack made by the gentleman from New Jersey.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the testimony of Commissioner of Reclamation Page before the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6845, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in submitting for your consideration the annual bill for appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1943, let me say at the outset that I feel that the committee has done a reasonably good job. The hearings began on February 23 and continued morning and afternoon every day, including Saturday, for approximately 1 month. This is not an easy bill to handle. As many of you know, there

are more items in the Interior Department appropriation bill than any other annual appropriation bill that has or will come before the Congress.

The committee, in considering the bill, was, for the first time in many years, without the valuable advice and counsel of our late distinguished and beloved chairman, Hon. Ed Taylor, of Colorado, who a few months ago, as all of you recall, passed to his reward after more than 30 years of very honorable service in this House. He was a member of the Appropriations Committee for more than 20 years, and for 18 years was a member of this particular subcommittee. We have missed him in advice and wise counsel.

The present distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], appeared before the committee at the opening session and made a valuable statement and questioned what may correctly be called the main witness, the Secretary of the Interior. Chairman CANNON demonstrated that he is very familiar with the items in the bill. And the Secretary of the Interior also demonstrated that he has a wealth of information. He speaks direct to the point and is not evasive, nor does he deal in glittering generalities.

Every member of the committee, both the majority and the minority, attended the hearings faithfully, appeared on time, and stayed until the last rap of the gavel, figuratively speaking. Many times we sat through the day without lunch, in order to expedite the hearings. I am glad to say that the minority members of this committee rendered very faithful and efficient service. There was mighty little partisan politics in evidence in the consideration of this bill. Although we were not always in agreement on certain items, and we sometimes had pretty hot discussions, generally speaking we got together on the items and this is more nearly a unanimous report from our committee than any other committee on which I have had the honor to serve. Of course what I say about the minority members applies also to the majority members of the committee. I told the full Committee on Appropriations this morning that we had divided up our work, that I assigned certain members to the various activities and that we found that method had facilitated and expedited our hearings and we believe that we approached the subjects in a more intelligent manner than we have ever before been able to consider a bill of this character and magnitude.

I cannot refrain from mentioning in particular one member of our committee who sat with us this year throughout the long ordeal of hearings, who will not be with us next year. I refer, of course to our beloved and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], who has recently received a very important judicial appointment in the State of Washington, and who, I understand, will be leaving soon for his new position. It is, of course, needless for me to tell you who know him that the gentleman from Washington is a tireless worker as well as one of our most effective and conscientious members. We shall miss him greatly,

and as he goes to his new field of endeavor where he will make a great Federal judge I am sure I speak the sentiment of every member of the committee and the House when I say that we wish him well in his wider scope of activity.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I rise to second the remarks just made concerning our colleague the gentleman from Washington, Judge LEAVY. As one coming from the far West, where irrigation is so supremely important, I value highly the work that the gentleman from Washington, Judge LEAVY, has done on the committee, especially with reference to reclamation. As I said before the gentleman's committee, I am saddened to think that we are losing him, but I congratulate the great cause of reclamation in that he, as a newly appointed Federal judge, is going on the bench at a time when judicial interpretations and decisions are to be made involving new uses and rights of water in arid lands. Such matters will come before him in the future for judicial as well as similar problems in the past for statesmanlike consideration. As I said also before the committee, I feel that we will have to have the due perspective of history in order to discern fully the work that he has done in the 5 years he has been a Member of this House and of this subcommittee. The gentleman from Washington, Congressman LEAVY, has been a statesman of the first order, working for legislation and governmental action such as would benefit generations yet unborn as well as for the benefit of those who occupy the land today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona for his very splendid statement, and I am sure what the gentleman has just stated reflects the sentiment of every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, there are 26 agencies and activities of Government within the Department of the Interior. It is not an easy thing to get the detailed information one needs to make an intelligent appropriation for any particular agency, when one has so many agencies to deal with. I am going to make a statement now that some may not appreciate, but I think I ought to make it. Thirty Members of the House appeared before our committee. Twenty-odd other witnesses also appeared, all of whom gave testimony to the needs of the various agencies and activities or projects in which they were particularly interested. The record discloses that each and every Member of Congress, including one able and distinguished United States Senator, asked the committee to appropriate funds in excess of the Budget estimate. I am safe in saying I think that if the committee had heeded the advice and suggestions of those 30 Members of Congress, instead of being able to bring in a report many millions of dollars below the Budget estimate, and many more millions below what it took to operate the Department of the Interior last year, this committee

would have been forced to appropriate many, many millions of dollars more than the Budget estimates and possibly more than it will take to operate this Department of Government for the current fiscal year.

I repeat that not one single Member of Congress appearing before the committee was able to point out wherein the committee might be able to reduce an appropriation below any Budget estimate.

May I call your attention to the fact that the Department of the Interior, without asking for it and possibly without any desire on its part, has become to a large measure a defense agency. I might almost call it a war agency. Except for the Army and the Navy, the Department of the Interior today is much more a defense or war agency than any other department of Government. That, of course, made it necessary, in some instances, to increase appropriations. I will mention some of those as I go along.

For example, the Bureau of Mines, which has always been an important agency, is now exerting practically all of its activities to an all-out war effort.

While we were holding our hearings there came in supplemental estimates for this Bureau, and I assume there will be additional supplemental estimates in those agencies that have been called upon by the War Department to render special service in connection with war activities.

There is the Geological Survey that has been called upon to do special work for the War Department.

There is the Reclamation Service that, to all intents and purposes, is a war activity or a defense activity. It is well known that an efficient war program cannot be carried to a successful conclusion without a tremendous supply of electrical energy. The Reclamation Service is engaged in a desperate effort to complete several large power projects in order that it may assist in relieving the power shortage which now threatens the country and the war program. Vast amounts of power being developed and about to be developed in connection with several of our reclamation projects, and power being developed at Bonneville Dam, which, as you know, was constructed by the engineer department of the Army, are vitally essential in the reduction of ores containing minerals of strategic importance such as zinc, lead, copper, tungsten, magnesium, and other minerals. The processing of ores to secure these essential minerals requires tremendous quantities of electrical energy and the production of this power on reclamation projects and at Bonneville Dam has proved of inestimable value to the war effort.

In connection with the Bonneville power development and the Grand Coulee power development, I am sure Judge LEAVY and others will discuss these items in some detail in connection with this bill.

May I pause long enough to say that in times past it has been somewhat difficult to get appropriations for some of these departmental agencies and activities.

For example, we have been told in years past that we were wasting money on some of these great reclamation projects; that there was no need of additional power; that there was no need for additional reclamation projects, but today we find ourselves in a position where the Government is actually faced with a shortage of power in many of those areas.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, what would have happened if we had not had some far-sighted men on this committee like the gentleman from Washington, Judge LEAVY, for example, who have fought from the very beginning for more power and more reclamation projects to create more power. I am wondering what we would do for magnesium and many of the strategic ores and materials that are so essential for the prosecution of the war if we had not made a fight for some of those activities for which the committee in the past has been seriously criticized, both in and out of Congress?

In an annual appropriation bill that was passed a few days ago we heard a great deal about travel pay, and many items of travel pay were cut. So your committee especially investigated and considered that part of the bill, and I am glad to report to you that travel expense has been cut from 5 percent in the strictly war activity agencies, like the Bureau of Mines, to more than 75 percent in some of the strictly nondefense activities. Altogether, we have cut travel pay in the various departments over \$571,000, or an average of nearly 20 percent, which occurs to me is a drastic cut.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Reference has been made as to reduction of travel allowances, not only in this bill, but in another previously considered. Recalling the support given by the gentleman in charge of the bill now under consideration, when efforts, some successful, were made to reduce travel costs in the Agriculture appropriation bill, I heartily congratulate him. Travel costs have for years increased without reason. In some instances they are little short of scandalous. Such waste and extravagance simply has to stop. So much Pullman travel and palatial hotel entertainment, while to be condemned in peacetime is absolutely inexcusable in wartime. In every effort looking to travel reduction costs the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] has been active, as in everything looking to proper economy so as to lighten the burden which taxpayers must bear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's very kindly contribution and will say to the gentleman that travel pay had already been cut in this bill tremendously before the committee began consideration of the bill.

Before taking up a detailed discussion of the bill, let me say I have just received from the Interior Department a special itemized statement as to the revenues of that Department. Possibly some Mem-

bers of Congress do not really understand that the Interior Department is one of the few departments that each year actually produces revenue to and for the Treasury.

I will discuss some of those a little later.

The total revenues of the Interior Department, as just handed me, amounts to \$52,922,624. I will include in my remarks an itemized statement showing where those revenues come from. For instance, there are revenues from the Grazing Service of more than a million dollars.

Revenues from the Bonneville Power Administration of more than \$6,000,000. Revenues from the General Land Office of more than \$7,000,000. Revenues from the Bureau of Indian Affairs of more than \$7,000,000. Revenues from the Bureau of Reclamation, and how much do you suppose? Over \$15,274,000. Revenues from the National Park Service of more than \$2,000,000. Revenues from the Fish and Wildlife Service, \$1,761,000. Revenues from Government and Territories of more than \$5,000,000. Here is the itemized statement to which I referred:

Department of the Interior—Estimated receipts by bureaus, fiscal year 1942

Bureau	General fund	Special funds	Trust accounts	Total
Office of the Secretary	\$440			\$440
Grazing Service	577,500	\$600,000	\$200,500	1,378,000
Bituminous Coal Division	5,134,489			5,134,489
Bonneville Power Administration	6,476,550			6,476,550
General Land Office	862,500	6,505,500	112,000	7,480,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,520,000		5,068,305	7,488,905
Bureau of Reclamation	3,201,000	12,000,000	73,000	15,274,000
Geological Survey	45,000			45,000
Bureau of Mines	45,000	50,000		95,000
National Park Service	2,202,255		38,140	2,240,395
Fish and Wildlife Service	1,548,160	98,000	135,200	1,781,360
Government in the Territories	425,085	5,000,000	100,000	5,525,085
Total	22,041,979	24,253,500	6,627,145	52,922,624

¹ Revenues collected by Internal Bureau.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. In other words, the revenue is about one-quarter of the total appropriation for the next fiscal year; is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe that is about correct.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is a remarkable showing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think the able gentleman from Kansas, and will agree that is a remarkable showing.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I think it would be interesting to learn just what disposition is made of this revenue. Is it used for the operating expenses of the various departments that bring in the revenue, or is it put into a general fund of some sort?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Some of it is used for that purpose, but the major portion of it goes into the Treasury of the United States, and, judging from what I hear, the depleted Treasury can use that \$52,922,624 at this time.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. It is a credit against this appropriation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. In effect; yes.

Now, I know what you gentlemen want to hear. You want to know the exact figures—how much the appropriation has been cut.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman did not mention the Bituminous Coal Commission. There was \$1,500,000 turned in last year, and this year it will come close to \$3,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I thank the gentleman for reminding me. The fact is there are several other items that I failed to mention specifically. I have, however, placed the itemized statement in the RECORD giving that information in some detail.

The Budget estimates considered for the fiscal year 1943 by the committee amounted to a total of \$180,317,266.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The committee recommends appropriations totaling \$162,634,845. You will note that the amount recommended by the committee effects a reduction under the Budget estimate of \$17,662,421.

The bill provides a reduction under the 1942 appropriation of \$75,466,435.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Is the greater part of this reduction due to the reduction of appropriations for special projects, or is a percentage of it also with reference to the operation of the Department?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from Arkansas that it is both a reduction of projects and other agencies. I will discuss reduction of travel pay later, but suffice to say this has been drastically reduced. The committee, as it were, went through this bill with a fine-tooth comb and reduced it wherever it was humanly possible to do so, without seriously impairing the efficiency of the agency or activities in question.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. I noticed in hurriedly going through the brief résumé in the back

of the report that there were several items for increases in salary for various purposes. Will the gentleman explain that if he has not already done so?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may have mentioned the fact to the committee a while ago that in every agency the committee allowed, of course, for Ramspeck promotions, for there was nothing that could be done about that and I believe there is nothing that either the committee or the Congress wants to do about that. Aside from the Ramspeck promotions, however, I believe the gentleman will find few if any increases in salary in the bill. On the other hand we eliminated salaries; in fact, nearly every proposed new salary was eliminated.

Mr. HOPE. I notice an item in the Secretary's office for salary increases of \$62,000 above the last fiscal year. Is that brought about by the Ramspeck Act?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; not altogether. That is brought about largely because the Division of Investigation of the Interior Department has been eliminated altogether and transferred to the Secretary's office, as the gentleman will see if he will turn to page 18 of the report. Does that explain what the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. HOPE. Then that does in large measure account for the increase in salary in the Secretary's office.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I think it is rather germane to the general explanation of the bill which the gentleman is so admirably making to call attention to a notification of a project which came to my desk just a few days ago, in fact, under date of March 16, the sponsor being the Department of the Interior National Park Service. It seems to me it bears directly on the item of \$208,000 for the administration, protection, and maintenance, and so forth, of the national historical parks and monuments. This item is for \$69,050 and is to improve buildings and facilities and grounds at the Statue of Liberty National Monument on Bedloe's Island, New York Harbor. It seems to me this item should more properly be considered in connection with the appropriation of \$208,000 carried on page 115 of the bill for the very same thing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from New York that an item for construction at the Statue of Liberty was eliminated by the committee, on the theory that it is not such an urgent necessity that it cannot wait awhile.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. That clears that up then.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I recall there was a Budget estimate for it, but the committee eliminated that as it did many other construction items.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Consequently there is no duplication as between the Work Projects Administration program and the Department of the Interior program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] mentioned a moment ago, the committee made a substantial reduction in funds for the Bituminous Coal Commission. We have recommended a cut in this agency amounting to \$178,246, yet this is one of the few agencies that brings substantial revenues to the Government.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. Does not the gentleman believe that is a pretty severe cut, in view of the fact that, as just stated, they are likely to have an income of about \$3,000,000 in revenues?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I agree that it is severe, and, frankly, that is exactly what the committee has endeavored to do this year in connection with this as well as other activities in this bill.

Mr. HOUSTON. It is a false economy and going a little too strong.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Possibly so. Some members of our committee think we have cut too drastically in this as well as other agencies. I may say to the gentleman that, in my opinion, there are many items in this bill that are cut severely, but again I must say that it was done deliberately, not as a slap or criticism of this or that agency. I believe the time has come when the Congress must cut and cut to the bone, and then cut again, especially in all nondefense activities.

Mr. HOUSTON. There is another item that I notice has been cut. That is in Indian schools. Does the gentleman offhand remember how Haskell was treated in that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will discuss the Indian Service presently; however, I am pleased to say in reference to Indian schools that Haskell got about the same appropriation that it received last year. There is no change in the appropriation and although living conditions are higher they will simply have to pull in their belt at Haskell, like everybody will have to do every place else, and live on a little less, as their contribution to the war effort.

This bill was originally cut about \$50,000,000 below the 1942 appropriation by the Bureau of the Budget. This original Budget came into the Department the day—the Saturday before Pearl Harbor. A cut of \$50,000,000 seemed so severe to certain department heads and others. Now, let me give you a bit of history with reference to this Interior bill.

I know there are some Members of the Congress who do not particularly admire the Secretary of the Interior.

They may not like the way he parts his hair or they may not have liked some statements he has made in reply to those who have crossed swords with him in debate, but let me tell you what he did. On Sunday when he heard about Pearl Harbor, he did not wait until Monday. Nor did he wait for orders from anyone, not even Congress. Secretary Ickes immediately put the Interior Department on a war basis. On Monday when ordinarily

one in his position might have complained about the \$50,000,000 cut below what it had taken to operate the Interior Department the current year, the Secretary of the Interior said, "We are going to voluntarily take another \$10,000,000 cut."

Did you ever hear of a Federal governmental agency doing that before? You never did. I will tell you why. Because it is the first time in the history of the Federal Government—and I measure my words—when any Federal agency or department ever voluntarily asked the Budget to cut them \$10,000,000 below any Budget estimate. Since that time some other agencies have followed the example of the Secretary of the Interior but up until then no other Federal agency or department or activity had ever done any such thing.

So when the Secretary and his representatives came to our committee and presented their bill it was not \$50,000,000 below last year's figure but, in round figures, a cut of \$60,000,000. Our committee, after hearing the evidence and after running through this bill, as I say, figuratively speaking, with a fine-toothed comb, reduced it still another \$17,700,000.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I notice another item here—coal and mining inspection and investigation, a reduction of \$61,000. Does that affect the safety of the inspection of mines at all?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, the committee felt that inasmuch as this is a new service it could take this drastic reduction without seriously interfering with the efficiency of the Department.

Mr. HOUSTON. I hope it works out all right, but that is a very serious matter. We have had a lot of losses in the last few years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Again I must agree with the gentleman from Kansas that it is a very serious matter, and is a very drastic cut.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I have not been able to analyze where the cuts in the Fish and Wildlife Service will be principally applied. I have heard a rumor to the effect that one cut will necessitate the closing of 12 fish hatcheries now being operated; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I regret to tell the gentleman that the rumor is well founded. It will necessitate the closing of some 12 fish hatcheries. Now, I think fish hatcheries are splendid activities; I believe that they can be justified from any viewpoint. Furthermore, in my judgment they could even be justified in time of war on the basis that there might be a shortage of food supplies; but, on the other hand, considering there was no Budget estimate for the hatcheries proposed to be closed,

the committee felt that among the many activities and agencies of the Department that no serious results would come from temporary closing of those hatcheries.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Will the gentleman state how much the committee proposes to appropriate for the operation of the fish hatcheries?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not have the exact figures at my fingertips, but I am sure you will find them in the hearings.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I have another question based upon that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Looking at the report, on page 43, column 3, the gentleman will find that \$906,715 is being made available for the propagation of food fishes next year.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Nine hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Nine hundred and six thousand dollars, which is a reduction of \$162,840.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is the point I want to raise. You take \$100,000 from the Fish and Wildlife Service, which is the old Bureau of Fisheries and the old Biological Survey, curtailing a benefit to all the people, in order to continue the payment of \$700,000 for the shooting and trapping of coyotes in the West. That is something that I cannot understand in effecting an economy in this program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am not surprised at what the gentleman says. We may talk rigid economy and think we are economy minded. When it is proposed to reduce or curtail any agency of Government in which Members are familiar with and are personally interested in, well that is a horse of a different color. I do not mean to be critical. I know the gentleman has had an important part in getting some of these hatcheries started and maintained, and I commend him for it, and yet, as important as they are, they might wait for awhile as a contribution to an all-out total war effort.

Let me say, however, in answering the gentleman's question, that the item for trapping coyotes in the West and Middle West has also taken a tremendous cut.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Sixty thousand dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is the reduction by the committee. I might add that the trapping of coyotes and other predatory animals, which the gentleman apparently feels is of such little importance, affects a majority of the States of this Union. The gentleman might have difficulty convincing cattle and sheep raisers that the trapping of coyotes and wolves that prey on their sheep and cattle is of such minor importance.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do not criticize any cut on a reasonable basis in a peacetime nonessential—from the standpoint of war—activity. I raise no issue about your cutting the appropriation for the Pittman-Robertson Act \$1,000,000. I raise no question about the general reduction in this item. The point I raise is, Why appropriate to the Fish and Wildlife Service \$700,000 for the stockmen of the West, when everybody

at all familiar with how the money is expended knows that it is an expensive kind of operation to spend \$700,000 in that way, and in order to maintain that expenditure cut something else that affects practically the whole Nation and affects a fish supply that, if once too badly depleted, we may be years and years in bringing back again? It is not that I question the cuts, it is the discretion you have exercised as to where the cuts should be made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think if the gentleman had listened to the testimony of the representatives from the Bureau of Fisheries and had the full facts that he probably would agree that the committee did the best it could, considering there was no Budget estimate for any of the hatcheries to be closed. The total cut in the rodent-control item was \$249,300, which includes a cut of \$65,000 by the committee. The amount recommended by the committee provides a sum 50 percent less than was appropriated for this purpose 2 years ago.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The statement the gentleman made with regard to eliminating 12 fish hatcheries in the country challenged my attention. As the gentleman knows, I come from Michigan. We have more than 12,000 inland lakes in that State. It is a great recreational State. There is only one Federal fish hatchery in Michigan. I rise to inquire whether or not you eliminated that one. It happens to be within my congressional district.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that I share his anxiety, since one of the Federal fish hatcheries happens to be situated in the district I represent in Congress. I must confess I do not know. As far as the record shows, however, there is no information that the gentleman's hatchery is one of the hatcheries that may be scheduled to be closed.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, the Federal hatchery at Northville, Wayne County, Mich., is not to be eliminated?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I cannot give such assurance, though I wish I could. That is, of course, up to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. We realize the responsibility you men feel in trying to make these cuts, and generally we want to make them. On the other hand, in connection with fish hatcheries and similar activities, we must proceed on the premise that they must have been reasonable and desirable expenses to begin with or they never would have been in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Inasmuch as that is true, and insofar as we go back and look at the record—and I represent California, where there are thousands of lakes in the mountains and where there are also commercial fisheries along the

coast—we find that the number of fish has been dropping, that there have been fewer and fewer and fewer of them every year. I know that from my own personal knowledge and what I have been told by others. There have been tremendous losses in the stock of fish. Does the gentleman think it wise to cut this appropriation, which may possibly result in wiping out these fish in many instances, particularly in view of the fact that fish is a food source?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would dislike very much to see any fish hatchery in the United States closed that can actually justify its existence, where the local people are cooperating, and where it has been successful. I am very much in favor of fish hatcheries. I believe in them. I think there is nothing that the local people appreciate more than fish hatcheries.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. May I observe that perhaps cuts should not be made horizontally. I think there is a more intelligent way to make them than to go into the final effect this will have on the cost of this particular Department. If we wipe out these fish, think what it will cost eventually to restore them. This either is or is not a necessary function. If it is necessary, it should be kept. I make the suggestion that the committee give further thought to this matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

May I make this general statement in reference to fish hatcheries. Let me again emphasize the fact that your committee did not arbitrarily withhold funds from 12 fish hatcheries in order to close them. I repeat that there was no Budget estimate for those 12 hatcheries and as I recall of the 30 Members who appeared before the committee only 1 Member, as I recall, the gentleman from Arkansas, even mentioned fish hatcheries.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. There was no Budget estimate at all?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. There was no Budget estimate for the 12 fish hatcheries, and I may say that neither the Bureau of the Budget nor the Department gave the committee a list of the hatcheries that it proposed to close.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Can the gentleman tell me on what page of the hearings I can find what 12 hatcheries are to be eliminated?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is impossible. The committee was not supplied with that information.

Mr. STEFAN. That is in the discretion of the Department?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; it is in the discretion of the Department. Possibly the Department itself does not now know. It is only fair to say that this suggestion was not made to the Budget on the part of the Bureau of Fisheries.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, the people want cuts made in every category that

represents nondefense items wherever they can possibly be made. We are all agreed on that, but I want to ask the gentleman a question about these cuts. Has there been anything done that will deprive the people of my State of stocking their lakes and streams with fish?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course, if the gentleman has a fish hatchery, and that hatchery should happen to be closed along with 11 other big fish hatcheries that will be closed, it may deprive some of his citizens from having as much fish in the future as in the past. That is conceivable and it will happen in my State, I am sure, as well as in other States.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows that in his own State and in my State we have had a drought, but rains have now come back to us again and lakes have been filled and people have just begun stocking these streams and lakes. We send applications to the Bureau of Fisheries for fish when the people back home send us the applications. We are just beginning to stock these streams and lakes. I agree with my colleague from Virginia that if we stop now the people in Nebraska and in your State and in some other States who have just begun rehabilitating and stocking these streams will have done a lot of things that are never coming back to them again. The people who live on the coasts and in the States that have a lot of lakes do not realize what it means to us in Nebraska to have water come back again and have lakes again and have fish again. We in the Middle West like fishing. But we will forego some of our pleasure if we are sure we are not being discriminated against. We are for everything that will help win the war. But give us equal treatment with other States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman in his splendid statement and also in his conclusions.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I was astounded at the gentleman's statement to the effect that the Bureau of the Budget had decided to close some of these fish hatcheries and did not condescend to tell Congress which fish hatcheries they were going to close, although these fish hatcheries and the Budget are all creations of the Congress. Now the people are appealing to us to represent them and to maintain democracy, which means representative government. Does not the gentleman think it is time that the Congress looked after these changes that are being made with reference to these institutions of long standing that have proved of such great benefit to the people in the various States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman but I am sure the gentleman understands that the Bureau of the Budget did not appear before the committee.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That is true, but I do not believe the Bureau of the Budget has the right to dictate to Congress about killing enterprises that the American people want and that they

are willing to pay for and that Congress has created. I would like to see some of the \$16,000,000 that was appropriated the other day for travel pay for the Department of Agriculture used to maintain these fish hatcheries that have proved their worth. I do not think the Congress ought to capitulate and let the Bureau of the Budget destroy them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Again I agree with the gentleman and I may say that when we reach the amendment stage in the consideration of the bill the gentleman will have an opportunity to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman that I respect his opinion and I am very fond of him, as he knows. I have great confidence in him and often follow his leadership, and I will be delighted to follow his leadership now if he will offer an amendment to put these funds back into the bill for the retention of all these fish hatcheries that are now in operation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I wish I could assure the gentleman I could do so, but a majority of the committee might not agree with me.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman tell us just where in the bill this provision comes and the amount that has been stricken? I want to save money, but as the Negro preacher said, I do not want to "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will look up the item in the bill under the caption "Propagation of food fishes," he will find where he can offer such an amendment. If the members of this Committee agree with the gentleman—and he has very persuasive powers and I may say is a man of power on this floor—he will have an opportunity to raise the amount for this purpose in the bill. But I will say, in passing, I would a lot rather be criticized for cutting this bill too drastically than to have anybody say that we are sloughing off money and refusing to cut nondefense activities.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The amount, as I see it, is \$906,715.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And what was the amount last year?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It was \$1,069,555 last year.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Would that be a sufficient amount to carry on these activities for the coming year?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It would be more than enough and I will be glad to discuss with the gentleman the exact amount necessary if the gentleman wants to offer that amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Has the gentleman's committee ever gone into the question, with the stockmen of the West, of the most efficient and economical method of predatory control, the bounty system as compared with the employees of the Government getting \$200 or more a month and all expenses?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think I may say to the gentleman that while there have been some statements in the past with reference to that matter, the committee has never made any detailed investigation along the line the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I hope at some future time when you can do so you will take some testimony along that line, because I believe we can save some money and get better results.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his valuable suggestion, and I now invite him to appear before the committee and make any suggestions that he has whereby we can save a dollar. I know the committee would be persuaded to follow the gentleman's invaluable advice which all of us deeply appreciate.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me again?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to be sure I understood the Chairman correctly when he said as to the amount that was eliminated, that there was not given to the committee a list of the 12 fish hatcheries that were to be eliminated from the schedule of fish hatcheries throughout the country. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say again that no such list of hatcheries that are proposed to be eliminated was given to the committee. The amount of the appropriation, of course, is in the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. That is the amount that has been decreased.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. In view of the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma demonstrated his desire to cut nondefense expenditures in the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill last week, I ask him if he would be willing to tell us about this money for irrigation, realizing that during the past 2 years, without any criticism of irrigation as a system of agriculture, we have been appropriating five and ten times as much for irrigation as we did previously and at the same time we have been spending millions, up to billions, of dollars to curtail production. I wish the gentleman would give us a little information on that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman raises a very interesting issue. I doubt whether he and I could reach an agreement in the next few minutes or hours with reference to the agricultural appropriation bill. I have not always been in accord with certain features of the agricultural measures as they have passed this House, but I say this to the gentleman, that, so far as irrigation projects are concerned, there has been a considerable amount of money spent by the Government to construct and maintain them, and there will be more money spent in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes

more. The gentleman's argument in peacetimes might be sound, but I am very much of the opinion that it would not be wise to curtail production if we are going to win this war. Of course, all of us know that we are going to win the war, and I have no patience with those who say that we might lose it, because America will never live in a world dominated by either Nazis or Japs. But we are not going to win this war solely with battleships, planes, powder, or guns, or torpedo boats, important as they all are. We are going to win this war when the Axis Powers run short of food and materials, and then God help America if we are in the same situation. That must not be. Yet I am fearful that the time is not far distant when the United States of America is likely to be found short of many food supplies that we now need unless we make sure that it does not occur.

Mr. MURRAY. That does not answer the question. I would like to know how this \$70,000,000 compares with the other appropriations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I say to the gentleman that, so far as reclamation projects already in operation are concerned, the committee followed the Budget estimate more generally than it has in many other of the items. For instance, a reclamation project might have 10,000 additional acres within its scope, which it is proposed to have operated next year. The committee in some instances has felt it would be justified in providing for the continuation, and in some cases for the expansion of some of those reclamation projects. If the gentleman will examine the bill, however, he will find that practically every dollar of increase in the bill is for power development. I have in my possession a letter, which I cannot put in the Record, of a confidential nature, from a responsible governmental agency advising that there is now a serious shortage of power in the United States, so serious that I will tell the gentleman off the record what it means in the reduction in the building of certain elements of vital importance in speeding up production and winning the war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am very much interested in the gentleman's observation about the shortage of food. For a year or more I have felt that we would have a tremendous shortage in this country. Can the gentleman give us the benefit of his thought upon that, as to what he thinks will be the primary cause of the shortage?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. To begin with, it is the war, which is No. 1.

Second, I would say that many, many workers will be called into the Army, the Navy, the air forces, and into the industrial centers, thereby taking them from the farm. There is now developing a very serious shortage in certain agricultural areas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Shortage of farm labor?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Shortage of farm labor.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman made the point of there being a shortage of power. Is it not possible to generate power by the use of coal?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. I may say that generally the production of power by coal is equally as cheap or cheaper than water power, provided an abundance of coal is available at or very near the power plant in question. But that situation is not always possible in many areas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman feel that our obligations as to food under the Lend-Lease Act places upon us an absolutely unknown factor insofar as food requirements are concerned?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, I think that is undoubtedly true. Of course, we know that we have sent to the Old World, especially to our Allies, several million tons of food. I am thankful that we had the food to send.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Three and one-half billion pounds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am glad we sent it, but, of course, I think our first obligation is to feed our own people and to see that there is no shortage of anything essential to winning the war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And to count the cost?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to finish the colloquy on fish.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I imagined the gentleman would come back to that.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to ask the gentleman, who is a very fine statesman—

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate that. It is like when my wife used to tell me she thought I was good looking. I was very suspicious that she did not mean it, but I appreciated it just the same.

Mr. STEFAN. But I do mean it. The gentleman and I have worked together on much legislation in which we had a common interest. He has helped me many times on good farm legislation. But I just wanted to finish the colloquy on fish. I wanted to be sure that there is nothing in this bill by which we are expending money for the propagation of fish or the stocking of streams with fish from the United States in Central or South America, a thing which we have done heretofore. The gentleman's committee has eliminated considerable money for cultural work among the foreign Indians in their various activities. I would rather help the American Indian first. Is there anything in this bill by which we are expending money for the propagation of fish in Central and South America?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman there is not a line of testimony nor a sentence in this bill that would so indicate.

Mr. STEFAN. I am happy to hear that because we in the Committee on Appropriations for the Department of State had some of that activity, and the committee was wise enough to eliminate some of it. Now, the gentleman has discussed very ably the proposition that there may be a great food shortage in this world. I want to say that I agree with him in everything he had to say, including the statement that we are going to win this war.

The question of food will have a great bearing on that victory, because it has been my own experience, and I wish to tell my colleagues of it, in foreign countries when war was raging to see the peasants and the old people who were left back home searching the fields of Europe for that last head of wheat or that last head of barley because the last gleanings meant a badly needed loaf of bread. There is a food shortage in Europe now. People there have been crying for food a long time. Many have already died there because they had no food. There is a great food shortage in the Far East where some of us have seen the beggar boats of China gather around the ships that came into harbor. Hungry people with their nets, trying to catch just a little bit of food that is thrown away. Those food ships come there no more. Those particular hungry people have no more food. Thousands upon thousands have died. Many more thousands will die. I wish to tell the able chairman of this subcommittee that we in America do not yet realize how precious food will be in the future. We are wasteful and do not appreciate our farm producers. We are throwing into the slop barrels of America enough food to feed hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of people in foreign countries who are hungry today. Don't underestimate the great store of food our farmers have produced for you. We thank God for it.

The gentleman has indicated that labor might have something to do with that. He and I, coming from farming sections, know that we may have a shortage of farm labor.

I want to ask the gentleman if he has told the membership of the committee anything about that section of the bill which will be found on page 80 and which in my opinion is subject to a point of order, which has something to do with the moving of Japanese away from the west coast—Japanese who might be brought into some parts of my State. My people may not want those Japanese. I would like the gentleman to explain just what this section means.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman it was certainly not with any degree of pleasure that any member of this committee voted to put that particular item in the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that re-

quest. We want to get through and start reading the bill today, if possible. I want to discuss that just a moment. Will the gentleman kindly withdraw it, at least for the moment?

Mr. BENDER. I will withdraw it, but we ought to have a larger audience present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, I am sure there is a quorum present. However, some committees are in session and Members know they can inform themselves about this bill by reading the RECORD and hearing the discussion under the 5-minute rule tomorrow and possibly Thursday.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I hope I may be able to conclude in 10 additional minutes. I would like to explain this one situation before I yield.

I said a moment ago that no member of the committee took any pleasure in putting that in the bill. I do not feel I ought to go into detail and say why it is in the bill further than to say it came as a special and we felt an urgent request. If you will read this morning's paper you will find that some 20,000 aliens and others are being shipped into certain areas, and I believe you will understand why it was necessary to put this in the bill without further discussion of details.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. I understood the gentleman to say there is a shortage of farm labor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is right.

Mr. HOUSTON. We all know that is true, we all know there is a shortage of farm labor. Why do we not curtail the activities of the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. under present conditions?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, I do not care to go into that now. I am strong for a drastic reduction for all non-defense activities, but surely the gentleman understands that the N. Y. A. does not fall in that category. It is today a defense agency. Every nondefense activity in the N. Y. A. in every State of the Union, so I am officially advised, was some time ago ordered eliminated—not curtailed but eliminated. In my State, for instance, and I assume it is the same in the gentleman's State, practically the only activities left in N. Y. A. are the master shops, where thousands of ambitious young men have received excellent training under seasoned, well-trained foremen. These master shops have turned out several hundred fine young men in recent weeks who have gone to Wichita, Kans., the gentleman's home city, a city that is a seething beehive of industrial activity. I wonder if my good friend, the distinguished gentleman, has in mind the training of those master shops as one of the activities he proposes to curtail?

Mr. HOUSTON. Oh, I am in favor of keeping any defense activity going.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thought the gentleman would be in favor of that. The fact is it would be a very serious blow to the several defense industries in his home city if the defense training program in Kansas, Oklahoma, and other nearby States were suddenly cut off.

Mr. HOUSTON. But as to the C. C. C. camp in my district, when they moved the camp out of there they burned the mattresses and sawed the handles off the shovels. Does the gentleman think that is good business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; of course not.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is why I want it eliminated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well I know how the gentleman feels; they moved my C. C. C. camps also. After July 1, however, I am told they will all be eliminated except those on military reservations.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. If this particular section of the bill was made for defense purposes I, of course, am not going to raise a point of order against it. The reason I call the gentleman's attention to it is because I believe the membership of the committee should know something about it. So far as I am concerned I do not believe the people in my State would like to have a lot of Japs come in on them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman. I do not believe the people of my State would like it either.

This particular item was put in with the approval and, I believe, at the suggestion of the National Reclamation Association.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio and Mr. LELAND M. FORD rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am very hopeful of concluding in 10 minutes. I do not want to speak too long. I yield first to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am trying to reconcile some of the January Budget figures with the committee's figures. Can the gentleman from Oklahoma tell us the approximate amount that will be devoted to power in this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It would have to be a guess on my part. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] will discuss this within a few minutes. My guess would be approximately \$50,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The estimate contained in the Budget submitted by the President in January was \$71,297,000 for total Interior Department appropriations.

We have an appropriation before us of \$162,634,000 or a little more. I am trying to find out what constitutes the difference in these figures.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not quite understand what figures the gentleman refers to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The estimate of appropriations given by the President in January

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. From what page in this is the gentleman reading?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am referring to the 1943 Budget estimate submitted by the President in January.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. For what?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. For the Department of the Interior. The total amount was \$71,300,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. You mean for the Interior Department in its entirety?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I fear the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Then I do not understand the figures.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has the wrong figures. The estimate was \$180,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is the estimate the gentleman has here, but that certainly is not the estimate contained in the January Budget. The figure in the January Budget is \$71,297,366.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have not the slightest idea what figures the gentleman is reading.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am reading from the Budget submitted in January.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. A few supplemental estimates came in since the Budget figures were submitted. But I am quite sure the gentleman is confused.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Possibly I can show the gentleman the figures to which I refer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. We will settle this once and for all. If I am mistaken, I am willing to be corrected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am wondering whether the estimates of appropriations that the committee refers to in its report may not in some respects be different than the estimates given by the President in his Budget.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The only Budget I have seen is the one that came to the committee, and the figures are exactly as I have given them, \$180,000,000 plus.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I wish the gentleman to understand that I am not questioning his figures. I am merely trying to reconcile them with the January Budget figures.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that the figures he has here were not submitted to our committee and, of course, they would not be in line with the appropriations for last year. The figures the gentleman gives do not take into consideration the public works appropriation, the appropriations in the public works chapter of the Budget.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman does not remember what that amount is?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I can give the figures to the gentleman. That figure is \$116,346,875. Add that to the \$71,000,000 and I think he will find that \$180,000,000, exactly as I gave it to him, is correct. Now, I wonder if I may be permitted to conclude without interruption. Later I will be glad to answer any questions.

The members of the committee are unanimous in the feeling that we should retrench expenditures which are not directed to war efforts. In this connection let me discuss briefly the rather drastic reductions in travel. I will give you some figures of reduction in travel expenses.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, as much as I regret to do so, I must ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, travel expenses for the next year have been reduced for the Bituminous Coal Commission alone \$65,000. The total travel reduction, which I believe I gave you awhile ago, was \$571,000. The travel item has been cut by the committee nearly 20 percent.

The soil and moisture item has been referred to as a nondefense item and therefore some have suggested that it also be drastically cut. The committee heard witnesses with reference to that work and decided it is doing a very splendid job. They administer 279,000,000 acres of land. Think of that, 279,000,000 acres of land in the Grazing Service, the Park Service, the Land Office, the Indian Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Fish and Wildlife Service. A large portion of this vast area is very seriously eroded. Much of such land is situated on the Colorado River shed above Boulder Dam. The committee was advised that 100,000 acre-feet of soil have been washed into Lake Mead above Boulder Dam since its construction. The committee feels that every possible precaution must be taken to stop this threat on the continued value of the dam.

The General Land Office. The gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] will probably discuss that in some detail. May I say that this is another one of the Federal agencies in the Interior Department that is saving money to the Treasury. Last year it turned into the Treasury \$7,000,000.

We now come to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which I will discuss only briefly. We have cut \$718,000 from this Bureau. We have eliminated funds provided in the estimate for the National Indian Institute which was mentioned a few moments ago, I believe by the gentleman from Nebraska. I may say to the gentleman that the committee after hearing the evidence decided to eliminate every dollar asked for by the Indian Service and recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. So there is not a dollar of appropriation in this bill for proposed Indian culture in South America or Mexico. We are much more interested in Indian culture in the United States of America.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to commend the gentleman and his committee for that attitude.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

Mention has been made that the Bureau of the Budget suggested that one lump-sum appropriation be made for 18

Indian schools. This is not the first time the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Budget have made such suggestions. The fact is that in 1934 the Bureau of the Budget sent to our committee a Budget estimate proposing to make the entire appropriation for the Indian Service in just a few, probably 8 or 10, lump-sum appropriations. Every year without exception the committee has refused to yield to the demand on the part of the Indian Service to make these lump-sum appropriations.

The main proposed lump-sum appropriation in this bill, so far as the Indian Office is concerned, was the proposal to put in 1 lump-sum appropriation item funds for the operation of 18 Indian schools. The Indian Office did not hesitate to tell us that it proposed to close 5 Indian schools, 3 of which had none but orphan Indian children, or children from broken homes. I am glad to advise that the committee refused to follow the suggestion of the Indian Service to make this lump-sum appropriation and we refused to follow the suggestions of the Bureau of the Budget. We made available funds to continue these little weak schools that are attended by the poorest children on the face of the earth. We took sufficient funds and from other departments and agencies to keep those schools going and made a sizable saving. One saving effected was to eliminate the funds requested for this Indian culture proposal.

The committee has not made an appropriation to continue the Leupp School and hospital in Arizona, because of a War Department request. While the committee was holding its hearings we got such a request. While the matter has not been finally determined we are reliably informed that the War Department will make use of this school and hospital.

I wish I had time to discuss the situation among the Indians in Alaska. Tuberculosis in Alaska is about 13 times as prevalent among the Indians as it is among the Indians of the United States and much more so than among other natives. It is many more times as prevalent, I understand, among Indians than among white residents in Alaska. That being true, it is a deplorable fact that there are only 32 beds available in one hospital for tubercular Indians in Alaska.

I may say here that last year the committee made available \$250,000 to construct a hospital in Alaska to meet this very urgent situation last year, but again the Bureau of the Budget decided that the committee did not know what was best, I assume, and in the name of economy impounded those funds, and that particular hospital has not been constructed.

I simply wish to express the hope here, as I did in the committee this morning and as I did before the subcommittee, that the Bureau of the Budget will find it feasible, practical, and humane to release the funds for that particular hospital in Alaska.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has the gentleman any figures showing the percentage of active tuberculosis among the school children of Alaska?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not have that percentage, but I know it is alarming.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wonder if the Delegate from Alaska can answer that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The Delegate from Alaska is here and will no doubt discuss the matter somewhat in detail later and answer any question the gentleman may propound. The gentleman may be able to answer the gentleman's question now; and if so, I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. DIMOND. I thank the gentleman.

As the chairman of the subcommittee has so well said, the incidence of tuberculosis among the native Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos of Alaska is about 13 times as great as in the United States as a whole. The incidence of that dread scourge among the children is equally high. It is one of the most serious problems we have with respect to the natives of Alaska to try to check and finally wipe out the tuberculosis which now rages among them. I am profoundly grateful to the gentleman from Oklahoma for the effort he has so unselfishly put forth to help us secure funds to enable us to take care of this distressing condition among the natives of Alaska.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the official records will show that in Japan, which is somewhat similarly situated, the figures exceed 60 percent of active tuberculosis among school children.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. In Japan? Well, as much as I despise the Jap war leaders, and as deeply as I feel that Japanese aggression must be destroyed, I would not want even our enemies to die with that dreaded disease of tuberculosis.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, again I am forced to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I asked Mr. Collier or someone else connected with the Bureau of Indian Affairs as to the increase in the incidence of tuberculosis, and found that since the white man established his way of life in Alaska tuberculosis has increased. We should do something to eliminate it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his very splendid statement.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. May I ask how that percentage compares with the percentage

of tuberculosis among the Indians in the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is about 13 times more than among the Indians in the United States, so I am advised.

I should like to discuss the road item for a minute. My distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT], the distinguished chairman of the House Roads Committee, and members of his committee, will be especially interested in this. The committee has made a reduction of \$1,302,000 in Indian road appropriations. For some years we appropriated \$5,000,000 for this important item. We were able to come before you and say that this \$5,000,000 would keep 10,000 or 15,000 unemployed Indians at work throughout the year. Year after year this item has been reduced. It came to us this year with a very substantial reduction. In spite of that, the committee, adhering to its determined policy to cut nondefense activities where humanly possible to do so, reduced this item of Indian road appropriations \$1,302,000.

The construction program for the Indian Service has been practically eliminated. Only \$366,000 is provided for all the construction work of its many activities, as compared with \$1,903,445 for the current year. Only items for essential repairs and to correct faulty sanitary and health conditions have been included in the bill.

Before I leave the Indian section of the bill, may I refer to one interesting discussion in the committee that I feel may be of interest to some Members. The discussion had to do with the service being rendered now to our country in the military and naval services by Indians of all tribes in many States of the Union.

Seventy-five Indians have been serving, and as far as we know are now serving, on the Bataan Peninsula, where General MacArthur and his brave men have made such a heroic stand. Most of these Indians are from Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma.

You may be interested to know that General Tinker, who is in command of the air forces in Hawaii, is an Osage Indian, and was educated at Haskell Institute.

The Indian Bureau told our committee that it had information that the percentage of Indians of draft age who voluntarily joined the military forces is considerably higher than that of any other group in the entire United States.

I have discussed the Geological Survey briefly, and the Bureau of Mines, and touched on the Parks Service.

I may say that the Park Service is reduced to a greater extent than any other service. The total amount recommended is \$5,322,000, which is \$140,890 below the Budget estimate. This reduction in the estimates of \$140,000 is reflected by a reduction under the current appropriation bill of \$9,287,000.

You may be interested in knowing that the Travel Bureau, about which there has been some discussion in the past, had more than \$75,000 last year for the operation of that Bureau. Now, because

of the fact that the Nation is in the throes of war and it is reasonable to expect that travel will be curtailed drastically during the next year, the Travel Bureau item came to our committee cut from \$75,000 to \$20,000, and after hearing the witnesses the committee cut it again half in two. I may say for the benefit of my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who did a good job in his efforts to cut travel pay in another bill and who I believe was not present when I discussed travel pay, that the travel pay is drastically cut in this particular item, as it is in practically every other item in this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. Why do you not cut out the Travel Bureau entirely?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The committee, after hearing the representative of the Bureau, felt that it is rendering a service that would not justify its being eliminated entirely.

There is one item under the fish-and-wild-life service that I think I ought to discuss briefly. A while ago I discussed some other items in connection with this activity, but I want to refer now to one item where the committee cut \$1,000,000 for the Federal aid to wildlife restoration, a reduction of \$1,500,000 below the 1940 appropriation. While this fund is secured through a special tax for particular purposes and a bookkeeping credit is set up for it on the books of the Treasury, a full expenditure of receipts will work toward depletion of general funds in the Treasury and it is believed that the sports people of America will recognize the situation and will cooperate with the Congress in letting this fund accumulate until our financial structure is in a stronger condition. The question has been raised that this is not money from the Treasury, that these are funds received from the sports people of America and why cut the funds? It is in a similar position to that of a tribe of Indians who come before our committee and say, "You cannot cut our funds for this, that, or the other purpose because these are our own funds." I realize and appreciate the force of that argument, and yet after all, it is our responsibility and the members of the committee feel that we may forego the spending of some of these funds at this time in view of the war, and build up a spending fund here of several millions of dollars to be used in post-war days that we hope are not too far around the corner.

I have one more item to mention and that is with reference to territories which I am sure the gentleman from Alaska and others will discuss in detail. The committee has brought in an appropriation of practically the same amount for the islands as was recommended by the Budget. This includes Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands, and as I have said, there are few changes.

In conclusion, let me say in a general way, as I stated at the outset, some of these cuts may be too drastic, and if so you will have an opportunity at the amendment stage of the bill to increase

them. Some of the items may not be cut enough, and if so I welcome an amendment from anybody who can find a place where they can further reduce this bill. But, on the whole, remembering the fact that the bill came to the committee \$60,000,000 below what it took to operate the same Department last year, and remembering also that this is the first department of the Government that voluntarily reduced its appropriations for next year after the Budget had made a drastic cut, it occurs to me that the committee has done a reasonably good job in further reducing the appropriations \$17,700,000 below the Budget estimate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, what I shall say, perhaps, relates to what you might call the Interior, but not specifically to this Interior bill. I think the Congress is entitled to have the benefit of a situation which I discovered over the week end on a visit back to my State of Wisconsin. It relates specifically to a loophole that appears in the tire-rationing program of this country. If there is any one thing that is threatening the economic stability of our Nation than any other it is the tire-rationing program. It concerns almost every person in the country that has used the automobile as a means of conveyance.

Under the tire-rationing program there have been set up in all counties of this Nation tire-rationing boards. I will confine my remarks to the tire-rationing board in my own county, which is headed by a patriotic citizen who is devoting his time without pay in an effort to carry out the purposes of the tire-rationing program.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-two Members present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 49]

Baldwin	Gore	Marcantonio
Barry	Hare	Martin, Mass.
Beam	Hart	Merritt
Bishop	Healey	Mitchell
Boehne	Holmes	Myers, Pa.
Bolton	Hook	O'Day
Bradley, Mich.	Howell	Osmers
Bradley, Pa.	Jarrett	Pfeifer,
Buck	Johnson,	Joseph L.
Buckler, Minn.	Lyndon B.	Pierce
Buckley, N. Y.	Kee	Plauché
Byron	Kelley, Pa.	Ploeser
Cannon, Fla.	Kelly, Ill.	Rivers
Celler	Kennedy,	Robinson, Utah
Clark	Martin J.	Sacks
Cole, Md.	Kennedy,	Satterfield
Courtney	Michael J.	Scanlon
Culkin	Kilday	Schaefer, Ill.
Dies	Kleberg	Schulte
Dingell	Klein	Scrugham
Ditter	Kocalkowski	Shafer, Mich.
Domengeaux	Kramer	Shannon
Durham	Lambertson	Sheridan
Eaton	Lesinski	Short
Elliot, Mass.	Lewis	Smith, Pa.
Faddis	McGranery	Smith, Va.
Fitzgerald	McKeough	Smith, Wis.
Flannagan	McMillan	Stearns, N. H.
Gale	Maclejewski	Stratton
Gavagan	Magnuson	Sumner, Ill.
Gifford	Mahan	Sweeney

Thomas, N. J.	Vreeland	Weaver
Tolan	Wadsworth	Wene
Treadway	Walter	White
Voorhis, Calif.	Ward	Worley

The Committee rose; and Mr. McCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6845, found itself without a quorum, that he thereupon caused the roll to be called, when 331 Members answered to their names, and he handed in the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will resume.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted I was discussing the question of tire rationing. We are all familiar with the fact that the Office of Price Administration is vested with authority to issue regulations with respect to the rationing of tires, and the Nation has been told that only those falling within the classifications set out in those regulations will be able to procure tires. I call to your attention a situation that has developed in my country, which I think offers a loophole in that law, which is causing grave concern and a great deal of discontent among the people of the Middle West. Under the regulations issued by Mr. Henderson's organization certain people in certain classifications may, upon application to the local tire administrator or the local tire rationing board, secure a certificate, which will permit them to go to a tire dealer and buy a tire. Among those falling within those regulations are farmers. Farmers are permitted to make application to the tire rationing board for tires to equip certain types of farm vehicles and equipment which are specified in the regulations. This situation has developed: For many, many years the manufacturers of farm vehicles have been selling in the open market through the farm-implement dealers types of light farm wagons, and to my certain knowledge those wagons have been sold to the farmers without tire equipment.

They have advertised the sale of those wagons to the farmers, advising them that if they will purchase a light farm wagon and can get hold of four old tires, if they will bring the tires into the shop selling the wagon the proprietor would mount the tires on the farm wagon, using pneumatic tires. The wagon itself is in the stock of the farm implement dealer. That has been a customary practice for years and years, and the practice has been for the farmer to buy a little light wagon, and then go out some place and get some second-hand tires with which to equip it. Every dealer in my district selling light farm wagons today, with the exception of the Sears, Roebuck Co., are continuing to maintain that practice. They all advertise and sell a standard light farm wagon that is built to be equipped with pneumatic tires, and they equip it with tires by going out and purchasing a used tire that is within the permitted class of tires that can be purchased without getting a certificate from

the Tire Rationing Board. What is Sears, Roebuck doing with the situation? They are advertising to the public, Come into our branch, and we will sell you a farm wagon at a cost of approximately \$147, and we will now sell you that wagon equipped with four standard new tires and tubes that are adapted to the use of an ordinary standard automobile. I said to the tire rationer in my county, "That cannot be possible, because the regulations have indicated that no new tires may be sold without a certificate from the Tire Rationing Board." He replied, "That is exactly what we thought the situation was—that is, as we interpreted the law—that if a farmer had bought the farm wagon and had come to the Tire Rationing Board for a certificate to enable him to furnish four new tires, we, under the regulations, give him that certificate, but as a condition of granting that certificate under the regulations, he would be required to sign an affidavit setting forth under oath that those tires for which the certificate is given by the Tire Rationing Board, are to be used upon that farm-equipment wagon and for no other purpose.

If he took those tires off of that wagon, having bought his tires through a certificate from the Tire Rationing Board and put them on his automobile, he would then be subjected to the criminal penalties that are provided in the law, and could be prosecuted. One such prosecution has resulted already in my district.

Now, that same farmer can go to Sears, Roebuck & Co., buy a farm wagon equipped with four standard automobile tires. He does not have to sign a certificate under oath to a Government official, such as the tire-rationing administrator. He is simply required to sign a little statement which does not put him within the provisions of the criminal act relating to this subject. He signs a mere statement that it is his intention to use those tires on that farm wagon. He takes the farm wagon home, takes off the new tires, and puts them on his car, and takes the old tires off of his car and puts them on the wagon, and thus by that subterfuge he has acquired a brand new set of tires without ever having gone near the Tire Rationing Board.

The situation has become so acute that traveling salesmen and others who are not farmers are now buying farm wagons from Sears, Roebuck & Co., getting four new tires, taking off the tires and putting them on their car, remounting them upon the farm wagon, and then selling the farm wagon, thus acquiring four new tires for less than they would have to pay if they got the tires from an ordinary dealer on a certificate issued by the Tire Rationing Board.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Is there some special regulation that applies to Sears, Roebuck that does not apply to the rest of the tire dealers?

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I do not know that, but I know that the facts disclose that when this tire-freezing order went into effect Sears, Roebuck had on hand one

of the largest stocks of automobile tires of any company in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. When this matter came to the attention of the chairman of the tire-rationing board in my county he was amazed to see the loop-hole that existed in this law. He immediately wrote to the State administrator at Milwaukee and wanted to know how it was that these tires were being shipped in by Sears, Roebuck & Co. and being sold without the purchasers having to secure a certificate from his Tire Rationing Board. Each county is given a quota of tires, a very exceedingly small quota in my county at least. He was told by the State administrator, "Why do you worry about it? Those tires are not charged to your quota and so it is not any of your business."

Now, I say to you Members of Congress and to the public, it seems to me, without making any charges whatever, that there is a situation which ought to call for an immediate and thorough investigation.

If this company, Sears, Roebuck, can dispose of tires in that manner and circumvent the law in that manner, and thus insure the mounting and ever-growing sale of farm wagons at the same time, so as to get people to buy farm wagons in order to get tires when they do not need a farm wagon but want the tires, and are thus circumventing the plain mandate of the law, as the public has been told it was, it seems to me we ought to find out just where the regulation came from that would permit Sears, Roebuck to do what no other company in my territory at least is privileged to do. No other person selling light farm wagons can sell a wagon equipped with four standard automobile tires, but Sears, Roebuck is doing it. Why?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We might just as well put the cards on the table. I am subject to questioning by the people of this country, as a Member of this House. We are at war. Mr. Leon Henderson is Price Administrator. Mr. Donald Nelson is head of the War Production Board. He is a former official of Sears, Roebuck & Co. Those two gentlemen are in charge. They are subject to being questioned by the people of this country. If there is anything to these charges, let those two public officials put their cards on the table and straighten up the case and get it behind us.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know what there is to the charges except what I have told on this floor. I am making no charges. I am giving the Congress and the people of this country some facts—facts which I have checked on a recent visit back to my district this past weekend. I want to tell the Members of this Congress, with all the sincerity at my command, if we do not do something about these things the people of this country are in revolt, and properly they should be. The man who has got the money to go out and buy a farm wagon

can get a set of tires, but his neighbor who does not have \$147 to lay down on the line and comply with the law is denied tires. Think of the break-down of morale in that situation, which is one of the most vital, affecting the economic status of our people today. If one person is going to be denied tires they should all be denied tires. That is what I say.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman believe that under the A. A. A. program, this farm-rehabilitation program, the farmer might be able to borrow money to buy the wagon if he agreed that he would not say anything against the A. A. A. until the loan is repaid? On the official blank "Application for Rehabilitation Goods," appears this condition—I quote:

I agree that at any time prior to the final liquidation of my loan from the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation to do nothing in opposition to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program.

Mr. KEEFE. This thing should not affect the farmer. The farmer can get an order from the Tire Rationing Board for tires to put on a farm wagon not equipped with tires, but he has got to sign an affidavit that those tires will not be removed from that farm wagon, and if he does remove them and put them on his car, he can be criminally prosecuted; but he can go down and get them from Sears Roebuck on a mere statement that he intends to keep them, and he is not bound by the criminal provisions of the code. They are buying farm wagons, taking the tires off and putting them on their cars. I do not blame them, but look at the loophole that exists.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON].

HOW WAR AFFECTS SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, we are indebted to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce under the able and intelligent leadership of Carroll L. Wilson, for a report on what war does to a region's normal economy. The Bureau has taken a leading role in the conversion of facilities from a peacetime basis to a wartime footing.

The Bureau's report shows that defense centers are areas of great activity, and in general small business in these areas, whether engaged in retailing, wholesaling, services, or in manufacturing, are sharing in the boom. However, certain types of retail and wholesale establishments have been definitely injured by restrictions on materials, and certain manufacturers have been forced to curtail activities through inability to obtain the necessary stocks of raw materials or finished or semifinished goods.

Outside defense areas the story is different. In general, business is becoming depressed; population is moving away. A high percentage of vacancies in residential and business property is the rule, and towns and cities are faced with lower valuations and greatly reduced revenues.

This is taking place in spite of the fact that cash farm income has greatly improved, and indications are that it will continue high in the current year.

Small business firms have felt the impact upon labor supply and labor cost of the brisk demand for skilled labor to man war-production lines. Shortages of highly skilled workers characterize the defense areas. While unemployment is still prevalent and no general shortage of labor exists, many skilled workers have been lost to war plants. This is, of course, partly the result of lay-offs due to the curtailment of civilian output. Looking forward to the time, however, when the plant facilities of these small manufacturers are mobilized into the vast structure of national war production, they will have the serious problem of rebuilding skilled working forces.

There is much idle machine-tool equipment. Even the most active firms engaged in war work are operating for no more than one shift, with few exceptions. In such instances two or three shifts could be added. In the main, however, the problem of putting these idle machines to work is one of conversion through subcontracting, pooling, or other means.

A very large portion of firms are operating with a high percentage of normal staff. Several reasons probably account for that. In some cases the firms are one- or two-man concerns in which reduction is impossible. Some firms maintain their workers on a part-time basis. In many instances the firms have been operating for years far below full capacity and normal staff has been adjusted to that basis.

To a large extent, firms reporting no Government orders, either on a prime contract or subcontract basis, are outside the defense centers. Companies in defense areas appear to have had much greater success in obtaining subcontracts. A general complaint of small subcontractors is that such contracts are obtainable only on an unprofitable basis.

Those firms which find it possible to continue in business are experiencing higher labor costs. Wage rates have advanced as Government contractors have striven to extend the roster of war workers. For those companies endeavoring to carry on in the face of sharply reduced operations, the problem of labor costs has been accentuated by lowered plant efficiency.

Kansas alone among the States in the Kansas City region has an increase in employment. Workers continue to migrate to Wichita for employment in aircraft plants. There are local dislocations in less-favored communities, of which all but a few have suffered a loss of population. The young people have gone into the armed forces or have moved to defense areas and that trend is expected to continue.

The trend in population which has not only reduced numbers in small towns but also raised the average age of the population, is of course not conducive to local business activity. An important offsetting influence this last year, however, has been the highest cash farm income

since 1920. Farm returns will be maintained at high levels in the current year. Nevertheless, these small towns and cities outside of defense areas have been faced with high percentages of vacancies in both residential and business properties, lowered valuations, and decreased revenues.

In the last few weeks, the situation has become worse. In many small towns, some of the principal businesses have been automobile agencies, repair shops, and filling stations. Restrictions on automobiles and tires have crippled an important segment of the economic life of these towns. Moreover, many persons formerly engaged in these businesses are now moving to defense areas for a livelihood.

In other ways, also, tire rationing may have the effect of reducing population in outlying towns and cities. Many workers found it convenient to commute to defense areas, maintaining their homes and families in the old home. Still others lived apart from their families during the week, and drove back each week end. The movement of workers and their families away from small towns has been accelerated by tire rationing. A radical increase in this trend is already indicated.

Further evidence of the plight of small towns is furnished by the experience of utility companies. An independent telephone company reported that in 90 percent of the towns served in Kansas the number of stations has been reduced. Sizable declines in the number of gas, electric, and water meters have been reported.

Machine shops in many small towns of Kansas employ normally from one to five people. Some are entirely idle and many are running at not more than 10 percent of capacity. Workers have been laid off and reemployed in war work in distant centers. In a few cases, the machines have been stored and the owner has joined the exodus to defense centers. Many machine-shop owners have already sold some of their equipment; such sales are increasing, and the end of the war may find the small towns without adequate machine-shop facilities.

Shortages of seasonal farm labor as a result of declining population in small towns threatens to become serious. Even though higher farm wages are paid, seasonal farm work cannot meet the competition of sustained employment in the war industries.

In only a few cities has population been maintained and these were generally located in or near defense areas. The centralization of war production is taking a heavy toll of the small towns, modifying the traditional patterns of life in the Middle West.

It is not too late to start an orderly approach to the whole subject of mobilization of industry and manpower and a better distribution of war facilities.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have a very real affection for the gentleman from Pennsylvania and just hope that in the beginning of his 25 minutes he will take it sort of easy, because before he gets through I know he will be going strong.

Mr. RICH. May I say to the gentleman from California that I have great respect for him. I know that whenever he takes the Well he goes to town and puts all the energy and steam into it he can. I will try to keep from breaking any blood vessels, do the best I can, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today the Interior Department Appropriation bill. I want first to pay my respects to the committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman; the genial gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK]; the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY]; and our good friend from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], on the minority side; and then coming over to this side we have the genial, good-looking ALBERT CARTER, from California, and my standby, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], who is always on the job and working hard. They are all fine fellows and they have worked hard on this bill. I certainly want to pay them my respects for their diligence in trying to perfect the bill we bring before you this afternoon which we call a perfected bill but which needs a few changes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an interrogation?

Mr. RICH. Certainly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wonder if the gentleman wants to change the general percentage of the House when he puts in the RECORD the statement that I and my colleagues on this side represent the minority? Does the gentleman mean that?

Mr. RICH. I will leave that for the gentleman to determine for himself.

Mr. Chairman, we will win the war with work, we will win the war with production, we will not win the war with spending. Ever since I have been a member of the Interior appropriations subcommittee we have had very great difficulty in trying to hold this bill down. The committee has always had so many demands made upon it not only from members of the committee but from every Member of the House trying to get something in the bill for his own particular district that it has been an almost impossible task heretofore. This year, however, we got help from all the members of the committee in trying to cut this bill down, and this is really the first time since I have been a member of the committee that we have all had the common thought in mind of trying to reduce the expenditures. This change of attitude has been brought about because we realize we are in a situation today where we must spend only for the essentials of the operation of Government; that the nonessentials should be left until after we win this war. That was the thought in the minds of the members of the committee, but before we complete this bill we are going to have an opportunity to reduce a number

of items still more. Some of them I will call to your attention now.

The Grazing Service is one where I think we can reduce the amount considerably.

Now, there is the Bituminous Coal Commission. You heard on the radio this morning the recommendation that the people fill up their coal bins now, because it is believed that it will be difficult for them to secure coal in order to fill their bins later on this fall. There will be no difficulty in the coal operator securing a price up to the point that Mr. Henderson will permit them for coal. The demand is here. Therefore we do not have to spend the same amount of money that we have been spending during the last 4 or 5 years on the Bituminous Coal Commission. The people in this Commission ought to be given jobs in other places in the Government where they can be employed at gainful occupations and in something that will be to the best interest in winning this war. We can eliminate at least half of this organization and put those people in other branches of the Government service.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman who had charge of this branch of the bill in the committee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The former chairman of the Bituminous Coal Commission, Mr. Gray, testified before our committee that if we eliminated the Bituminous Coal Commission or even a part of it they would have to set up a new commission to take over the distribution of fuel in the United States and that their salary would come out of the taxpayers direct, while if we continue the present Commission there will be about \$3,000,000 turned back into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. RICH. If Mr. Gray cannot handle this job with half the men he has, we ought to get somebody in place of Mr. Gray. I am sure however, Mr. Gray can do the job. The Bituminous Coal Commission for 7 or 8 years has been a large organization trying to determine the price of coal. It has gone into the matter from every angle. That body is not essentially necessary as I see it today in the handling of this branch of the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman go so far as to say, based upon his study, that it is very good practice and perhaps a necessary practice for the people of this country to now fill up their coal bins in order to avoid as much of a load on the transportation system next fall as is possible?

Mr. RICH. I think that is a wise thing. I think the people of this country should fill up their coal bins soon after the 1st of April so that they will relieve the railroad companies of this burden next winter. The railroad companies will be able to deliver now, the miners will have full work during the summer and this will be a great help in winning the war. The people then will be able to take care of

themselves and will not have to depend on the Government to do it later on this fall.

We come now to the soil and moisture conservation operation for which there is in this bill \$1,300,000. It seems to me we ought to make a great cut in this part of the bill.

The printing and binding section of the bill ought to have a still further cut than we have been able to make.

We come next to the Bonneville power project out in the State of Washington from where my good friend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] hails. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] is probably the best getter we have in Washington, so far as I know, but we have in there an item for transportation of power for building up new lines and for securing contracts for the use of this electricity. If the statements that have been made before in reference to the securing of contracts and the demand for power are true we certainly can cut this item in half.

Then we have an item in here for surveying public land. There has been more money spent in surveying public land in the last 3 or 4 years than has ever been spent in all the history of our Nation for surveying. This could be deferred until after we win the war and thus save those engineers, to be used on other Government work. The Government needs many engineers at this particular time.

We also have an item in here for rehabilitation of needy Indians, \$1,000,000. It seems to me that with the demands we have for labor now the Indians could be given work on the outside that would relieve this item a considerable amount, if the Indian Bureau will use its best endeavor in trying to see that these men are given jobs. I am sure they can do that, and we ought to reduce the item.

Then we have the reindeer service in Alaska, \$91,160. Do you remember what a good time we had during the last 3 or 4 years talking about Santa Claus and the reindeer? The majority party put over a bill to buy those reindeer up in Alaska. The United States Government now owns them. It has cost the Government a million dollars all told. Because we put up a fight we did to save a couple of million dollars in the purchase price, but we do have the reindeer. Every member of this subcommittee I think admits that the purchase of these reindeer has proven a failure, but we still have in the bill \$91,000. If we would give the natives of Alaska a bounty of \$50 apiece for catching wolves we would do more to aid the reindeer industry in Alaska than any other thing we could do. We would save the men up there who are acting as herders and men who are looking after the reindeer. The elimination of those wolves will do more for the reindeer and to furnish food for the Alaskan people than anything I could suggest.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In reference to the reindeer proposition, from the commit-

tee's report I notice a statement to the effect that there have been 34,000 head of reindeer lost on account of the depredations of wolves and from other causes. What does the committee understand is likely to happen to the 50,000 reindeer left in the herd?

Mr. RICH. Unless we get rid of the wolves, I do not know how you are going to maintain the herds up there. I might cite you this: In the State of Pennsylvania 30 years ago we had very, very few deer. We paid a bounty on wildcats and other obnoxious animals that would kill the deer, and prohibited the running of dogs. Today we have more deer in Pennsylvania than were ever known in that State. The year before last, when we permitted the killing of both does and bucks, several hundred thousand of them were killed.

If they would do the same thing in Alaska, if they would offer a bounty large enough so that the natives would trap the wolves, they would do more, in my judgment, to aid in the raising of reindeer than by hiring three times as many herders as we have trying to keep the wolves away from the reindeer, because they are unable to keep the wolves away. I am told that one wolf will kill a reindeer each day. He will just take out of the deer that part that he likes, which is the blood from the neck and part of the front quarters and the heart. Then he will let the carcass lie there. If we make an effort to rid Alaska of these wolves, we shall be doing more than anything else to save the reindeer of Alaska.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But there is nothing in the bill to provide for any such bounty?

Mr. RICH. No. I understand that in Alaska a small bounty is paid on wolves, but if the Federal Government would spend the money we are spending here and eliminate the herders and give a \$50 bounty on wolves, I venture the assertion that we would not have 25,000 deer destroyed this year. And we would kill or capture hundreds of wolves.

I am not going to take much more time pointing out the various items in this bill that I think ought to be cut. We shall do that with amendments when we start reading the bill for amendment tomorrow. I hope you will all be on the floor then so that you can aid those of us who are desirous of cutting this bill still further, because, as I said before, if we want to win this war we must conserve on nonessential Government expenditures, and we have a good opportunity in this bill to do so.

As to the National Park Service, I suggest that you place a 10-percent cut on the operation of all the national parks in this country, and take it off in 1 item. That would be the quick way to do it, and it would probably be just as good as if you would knock 10 percent off of each item. By doing that we would save offering about 50 amendments to the bill.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman has discussed how we might get rid of the

wolves in Alaska. Would the gentleman care to discuss how we might get rid of the wolves in Washington?

Mr. RICH. I suppose the gentleman from Ohio in referring to wolves means those who are getting out of the Government things which do not rightfully belong to them, or getting more than their share of the currency of the United States for doing a little work. Is that what the gentleman means?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I mean those who are getting juicy meat that belongs to the Government. The gentleman and all other Members of Congress know what I mean. It is a problem that is worrying us and worrying the people.

Mr. RICH. If I wanted to do that, first I would say to the War Department and the Navy Department, as well as the President of the United States, who have the greatest amount of money to spend that has ever been given to any three departments of the Government in all history, that if they do not scrutinize the expenditures you are making and keep the wolves from getting more than a fair profit—and by that I mean industry, by that I mean radical labor leaders, by that I mean everybody who is getting too much for the service he is rendering to the Government—this country will be on the road to bankruptcy. We will not be able to endure it. We cannot win this war and keep it up.

When this administration came in power in 1933 they talked about the money changers in the temple. I remember, oh how well, they sang the song here in the House of how they would drive the money changers out of the temple. I can remember when President Roosevelt made his first inaugural address he talked about driving the money changers out, but goodness knows he has been the greatest money changer this Nation has ever seen. He has changed the money from the people of this country that have to the have-nots, and the first thing he knows he will break everybody and break the country. He has \$35,000,000,000 to give away under lease-lend. I wonder whether some day when this is all given away, and remembering the \$15,000,000,000 these foreign nations owe our country, will we have anything left?

I think the Congress of the United States is responsible for that. The men who voted to give him that power should take it away from him and assume that responsibility so that we have no wolves. It is your duty and it is mine to see that we do not have the spending that is going on in this country.

I picked up a paper yesterday morning and saw where some girl made \$13,000 in the month of February. No girl or no man in this Nation should make \$13,000 profit out of the United States by working 6 or 8 hours a day, I do not care who he is or where he comes from.

Have I answered the question of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman certainly has given an answer that shows he understood the question.

Mr. RICH. You know what I think about it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman does not think that \$11,000 in 3 days for a secretary of a company, as was stated in this morning's paper, is not pretty good reindeer meat to get out of the Government?

Mr. RICH. If she got \$1,000 in 3 days it would be too much money.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has mentioned the case of Jack & Heintz, Inc., of Ohio. In my opinion, the Congress will have to answer on that proposition. Let me submit this question to the gentleman as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. After Congress appropriates these tens of billions of dollars for the war effort, what control have we as a Congress over the expenditure of these dollars?

Mr. RICH. The Congress has nothing to do with it because you have put that power into the hands of the Chief Executive and the Army.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then let us make that clear to the country.

Mr. RICH. The Army does anything the President wants, and Mr. Roosevelt is responsible for those contracts, and I want to go further and say that Congress has no business giving him that power.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman on that, but he has the power. Now, let us go a step further. There is a Priorities Board, is there not?

Mr. RICH. I think so; yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And that Board can say to every industry in this country exactly what it can have in the way of materials. That is true, is it not?

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then there is a Department of the Army and a Department of the Navy, and a general set-up of the Government for making contracts.

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And the administrators of these contracts agree with these companies as to what prices they may charge for equipment of airplanes and the ships and the field guns and everything else. That responsibility is not upon the Congress of the United States, is it?

Mr. RICH. No; it is the President's responsibility, and that practice is wrong.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us straighten that out now.

Mr. RICH. It should not be permitted, because the ones who are issuing those contracts should certainly know that when a man is making 50 percent or 100 percent as a profit, that is too much, and they should never give anybody a contract of that kind.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are plenty of ways for the administrators of these contracts to find that out.

Mr. RICH. Absolutely. They should get the information if they do not have it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is no difficulty whatever in finding that out, and my question is this: Is that responsibility upon the Congress of the United States

at this time, or is it upon those Government officials who let the contracts?

Mr. RICH. That responsibility is upon those officials who let the contract since the Congress has given those men that right. That right was given to the President of the United States and the Army and they are the ones who are responsible after the Congress did what it has done. I say the Congress should never have given the President and the Army that power.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman on that. Now let us see if we can do it in this way. Would the gentleman recommend that we repeal that part or that power and, if so, what procedure would the gentleman set up for letting the contract?

Mr. RICH. We should repeal that power to the President. I will tell you that the people of this country today are all interested in winning this war. If there is anybody who wants to win the war, I am that person, but I was opposed to getting into this war—get me right there—and we could have stayed out of it if we had run things in the right way. But that is neither here nor there now. I am for winning the war. Now, anybody who criticizes the administration for anything that is for the best interest in the direct winning of the war, they are criticized and they want to call you or me or whoever criticizes the administration fifth columnists, but we are only looking after the interests of the Federal Government when we act in that way. We are not fifth columnists. You are not a fifth columnist and I am not a fifth columnist. We are only trying to serve our Nation in doing those things which are for the best interests of the people so that we will have enough money to support this war to the bitter end, furnishing MacArthur and his men with the guns and the ammunition to prosecute the war until we do win it. To maintain our Government and our liberty.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

FRIVOLOUS FOLLY

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, because of a popular uprising against the way civilian defense was being operated, the fan dancers, et cetera, there has been recently transferred from the Office of Civilian Defense to the Office for Emergency Management and put under the direction of the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, a division which is concerned with the promotion of sports—not what you think but games and other forms of recreation for civilians—when we are at war. It is not funny.

Now, I know that the health and the fitness of American youth is essential. I know also that for years the fathers and mothers, the schools and colleges, and every other instrumentality which has had in mind the upbuilding of the physical qualifications of the coming generations, have devoted their time and effort to developing the Americans of tomorrow along the lines of physical fitness for whatever the future might hold in store. Those organizations are already estab-

lished, functioning, and all-out to do their part to help win the war without Government interference.

A FANTASTIC EXTRAVAGANZA

To suggest that the Federal Government should undertake to tell the fathers and mothers, and the States and towns and villages of this land that only it, the Government, could know who was fit to undertake to act as physical fitness director, at the expense of the taxpayers of the States, is so ridiculous, so foolish, so asinine, as to make everybody who had anything to do with the establishment of such a program look exactly as you think he does. If you want to know how they look, all you have to do is ask the public which thinks it is a joke, but a joke at its expense, and it is getting sick and tired of this type of humor.

UNCOMIC RELIEF

The attitude of the public in fairly reflected by the Chicago Daily Tribune in an editorial which appeared on March 18, 1942, entitled "Most Uncomic Relief," and which reads as follows:

Looking at the Office of Civilian Defense, one would be justified in concluding that it was devised to provide low comedy relief for a war-harassed population. But inasmuch as the agency was organized on the assumption that American civilians may some day face the same hazards that war has brought to civilians in Europe and Asia, its frivolous antics are distinctly unfunny.

Senator BYRD recently called attention to the Office of Civilian Defense's Division of Physical Fitness. No sooner had he done so than Office of Civilian Defense Director Landis sloughed it off—not off the shoulders of the taxpayers, to be sure, but to the pay rolls of Social Security Director McNutt. The boondogglers aren't fired; merely shuffled.

The activities of the Director of the Division, Jack B. Kelly, seem designed to make the public forget even the frivolities that Mrs. Roosevelt sponsored during her disruptive and unhappy tenure in the Office of Civilian Defense. His specialty is the appointment of a national coordinator for every athletic activity that any one in the country has ever attempted. At last report he had 61 of them, not including log birling. He has, however, not neglected such esoteric pastimes as weight lifting, horseshoe pitching, and code ball.

Code ball, it appears, is a distinct relative of golf in which the player kicks the ball without the usual formality of first throwing his clubs into the nearest water hazard. He has no clubs to throw. The inventor, and thus the natural candidate for national coordinator of the sport, is Dr. W. D. Code, an estimable physician of this city. Dr. Code, with the benevolent patronage of Mr. Kelly, may be depended upon to use the war emergency to the limit to popularize his particular pastime, just as the principal manufacturer of bowling supplies has been successful in installing an executive of the agency which handles its advertising as the coordinator of bowling.

SPORTS OR SPORT

The place of sports in the war effort, meaning games, not those selected as administrators, is at best an unimportant one. The American people have been devoted to 61 varieties of sport that Mr. Kelly has dug up to coordinate, and in war as in peace will, no doubt, continue their participation so long as they have any money for it, after paying their tax and grocery bills. It is impossible to see why their activities in this direction need coordination, but the reason why it is provided is simple. It flows from the same

social-worker cast of mind that in every conceivable direction is turning the conduct of this war into another New Deal boondoggle. This is the cast of mind that firmly believes that the people are incapable of doing anything for themselves and must have directions from a more enlightened source to conduct the simplest of their affairs.

BUSY BEES

Mr. Kelly and his busy bees in the Office of Civilian Defense are as firmly convinced that the ping-pong players can't get along without guidance as the bureaucrats in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration are convinced that the farmers of the United States haven't sense enough to plant the proper crops unless they have an Agricultural Adjustment Administration quota system to tell them what not to plant.

Mr. Kelly has asked Congress for an appropriation of a million dollars with which to carry on his fantastic program, and is quoted by Senator BYRD as saying that unless he receives at least \$300,000 he will resign. This appears to be a heaven-sent opportunity for Congress.

CRAP-SHOOTER COORDINATOR

One of my long-time colored-boy friends said to me on my way over to the Capitol today, "Mr. PLUMLEY, I make application to be appointed crap-shooter coordinator for the Capitol air-raid shelters if this recreation business I hear about comes true." That is the answer.

HORSESHOES AND MARBLES

The Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph had this to say editorially on March 17:

What can be the matter with our Government, anyway?

Do children's marble games in public schoolyards speed the production of airplanes and tanks and ships?

Can Hawaii be defended by canoeing in the Rappahannock River?

Can the Philippines be redeemed by lifting weights in Trenton?

Can Australia be saved by archery in the Adirondacks?

Does it help MacArthur and his gallant men if young men pitch horseshoes in Philadelphia or in Hoboken?

Pastimes are all right in their proper time and place; but what have such pastimes as billiards and badminton to do with the grim and grisly business of winning a "total" war?

PATERNALISTIC PROFLIGACY

Or why must a war Government, on which the despairing hopes of humanity rest, pause in its stern duties to lavish profligate and infantile paternalism on nursery games and penthouse "athletics"?

And this Office of Civilian Defense extravaganza is only a part of official Washington nowadays.

The terrible disorganization existing in the Government, the conflict of irreconcilable interests existing there, the waste of tax money, the dispersal of effort—the sheer confusion, in brief—has become so complete as to comprise almost a pattern in itself.

Maybe it is not an accident or the product of boundless incompetence, after all.

Maybe the new dealers have "planned it that way."

POOR, PURE PATERNALISM

I say that for the Federal Government to go so far outside the boundaries established for it, and to so far interfere with the lives and the liberty and the habits and the customs of the people of the several States is paternalism gone mad. It would be almost unbelievable were it not for the fact that so much has been

done along similar lines of late, without any justification or reason, and always at the expense of the taxpayer, measured in dollars and cents, and sense, and in every other way.

The truth is some people have just gone crazy with their egocentric notions that it is up to them to save the world while they have the chance to demonstrate their superiority complex.

The time has now come for a show-down and for reflection, glamour girls or not. We must get back onto the bare ground of reality. Let us forget Hollywood and Eleanor for a minute, or forever, which would be all right with me. It is time to realize that there is a bottom to the barrel of money into which the taxpayers have poured their all and out of which have flowed the funds to finance all these senseless theories and experiments and fantastic folderol.

WE ARE AT WAR

We are at war, despite which fact so many seem bound and determined to carry on their program of wasteful extravagance and useless expenditure of the hard-earned dollars of the people, who profit least by reason of what is being done to them under the pretense of doing something for them.

Now here comes this physical fitness program to break the camel's back, following a period when these same proponents, who now urge this program, protested vigorously against training for physical fitness of those in the Civilian Conservation Corps. The program they offer does not make sense in any respect, and it should not be permitted to be carried out.

I agree with the distinguished dean of the minority, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], who said recently:

To my mind, nothing is doing more to undermine public confidence than the bungling and frivolous manner in which a vital and important branch of our defense program—the matter of civilian defense—has been and is being carried on.

Of course, the Office of Civilian Defense is a relatively new agency, organized to deal with a matter about which we, in this country, have had no previous experience. Some mistakes might therefore be anticipated and condoned, but we have the right to expect that the responsible officials of that agency would at least have some slight conception of the object and purpose for which it was primarily created, or ought to have been created, namely, the protection of civilian life and property. The sad fact is, however, that they have not demonstrated any such understanding. Instead of concentrating their activities on air-raid precautions, they have used a large part of their funds to carry on various sociological and entertainment programs more related to Sunday-school picnics than to the fierce realities of war.

While our people throughout the country have been crying out for instructions as to what to do in case of an air raid, and how to take measures for their protection; while they vainly seek instruction in the use of gas masks, in the handling of incendiary bombs, and in first-aid work; while they await the production and distribution of gas masks, steel helmets, auxiliary fire-fighting apparatus, and other necessary equipment, what do we find the vital and important Office of Civilian Defense to be doing?

Up until the time Dean Landis recently took charge of that agency, it was devoting its

energies and funds in a large measure to such frivolous activities as these:

Hiring a professional dancer, at \$4,600 per year, to "develop dancers, rhythmic exercises, and the like, particularly for children who might be congregated together in times of disaster, such as air raids and the like."

Hiring a Hollywood movie star to arrange for public entertainments.

Hiring a colored track star, at \$3,200 per year, to serve as a "roving staff assistant" on racial relations.

Hiring a number of racial relations advisers at \$4,600 per year.

Hiring a newspaperman, at \$12.77 per day and expenses, to go around the country writing "human-interest stories" relating to civilian defense.

Hiring a football coach, at \$4,600 per year, to promote sporting exhibitions of all kinds and encourage physical recreation programs.

Hiring a consultant on labor problems at \$22.22 per day.

Setting up a Know Your Government Division, with a chief receiving \$3,000 per year, consultants receiving up to \$22.22 per day and expenses, and a number of other highly paid executives.

Setting up a Physical Fitness Division, with a large number of high-salaried employees receiving up to \$5,600 annually.

Setting up a Youth Activities Division to carry on various activities among the younger people.

None of these activities and others I could mention have the slightest relationship to the ostensible purpose of the Office of Civilian Defense, which ought to be to provide for the protection of life and property in case of air raids. Just why they should have been allowed to have been carried on in the first place is difficult to understand, but what is most deplorable is that many of these activities are still to be continued under the new head of the agency, Dean Landis, of the Harvard Law School.

It is true that Mr. Landis has made some changes in the organization which he inherited from his predecessor, which do away with some of the criticisms which have been leveled against it.

However, in the case of the Physical Fitness Division, its activities and personnel are simply being transferred to another Government agency, under Mr. McNutt. The public money will thus continue to be spent for the physical-fitness programs.

I therefore have offered a resolution which reads as follows:

Whereas there has been transferred from the Office of Civilian Defense to the Office of Emergency Management a division now under the head of Defense Health and Welfare Service, Paul V. M. McNutt, director, which division is concerned solely with the promotion of sports and other forms of recreation, headed by a so-called physical fitness director, and consisting of approximately 50 branches under the supervision of so-called national coordinators and their staffs; and

Whereas such activities are entirely unrelated to the purposes for which the Office of Civilian Defense was created; and

Whereas such activities constitute an unwarranted and wasteful expenditure of public funds, and are, in every respect contrary to sound public policy in such a crisis as that which confronts the Nation at the present time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives (1) that the President should immediately order the discontinuance of all such activities by the Office of Emergency Management, and (2) that such activities should not be transferred to any other department or agency of the Government.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I know that upon occasions of this kind it is quite right and customary to pay tribute to your colleagues on the subcommittee who work with you in the preparation of the bill that is being submitted. I shall recognize that worthy custom. This is my last address on this floor under general debate on an appropriation measure that I have had the pleasure of participating in writing.

Most of our subcommittee has worked together for the full 6 years I have been here. I have found great satisfaction in being on three different subcommittees, all of them made up of splendid men. However, the one that writes the Interior Department appropriation bill, I think, has a greater task and a greater responsibility, if I may thus express myself, than any other general supply bill. For the first time, after a lot of hard work, a great amount of earnest effort, we have reported here a bill for the Interior Department that more nearly meets with general approval of all the subcommittee than ever before written by the committee, and it was reported out of the full committee this morning without any dissent.

Two weeks ago, when we were considering the agricultural appropriation bill, I heard Members on both sides of the aisle, good friends of mine, repeatedly say, "Wait until we reach the Interior bill, and that is where we are going to do some cutting." Now that the bill has been reported, and the result of the careful, painstaking work that has been done by the subcommittee is taken into consideration, I think there are grave doubts in the minds of many of the Members of this House that the amount ought to be further reduced.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. Yes; I yield to my distinguished friend from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I just want to remind the gentleman that the agricultural appropriation bill went through the full committee just as serenely as this one did. I suggest that the gentleman do not take too much for granted.

Mr. LEAVY. And I may say to the gentleman from Kansas that I take nothing for granted in this House, and never have.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But there is one thing that we can depend upon—it will not have any rougher voyage than the agricultural bill had.

Mr. LEAVY. I am convinced that if it is treated anything like the agricultural bill was, in view of what the committee has done in the way of reductions, we might just as well eliminate the Interior Department in the Government and turn it over to the War and Navy Departments. I know that no gentlemen think that either good judgment or wisdom.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This bill involves an expenditure of \$162,000,000, does it not?

Mr. LEAVY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the gentleman notices, of course, that there are less than 40 Members on the floor.

Mr. LEAVY. I have not counted the Members.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have.

Mr. LEAVY. But I assume that the Members read the RECORD, like the gentleman from Michigan does, when he is not on the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman tell me when I was not on the floor? I do not recall an incident of that kind.

Mr. LEAVY. I am not keeping track of that or having a check upon the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I merely want to answer the roll call.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It ought to be noted of course that we are just in general debate all this afternoon.

Mr. LEAVY. That is correct, and I don't think that any one, even the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will challenge the good faith of the membership in the performance of their duty, because they do not happen to be here at the moment. I know that the membership individually has a multitude of responsibilities and duties, and they must of necessity have some time in their offices to take care of things other than those that are pending on the floor at the moment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And I am sure that if the membership had known that the gentleman, who is a judge now, or about to become a judge, were going to speak, they would all be here. I am not criticizing the Members for not being here, but it does seem, when we have these bills appropriating such large sums of money under consideration, that we should have more on the floor. I know that Members are receiving hundreds of letters insisting that we adopt some labor legislation, and, of course, some of the Members are in trouble and naturally they want to answer a lot of those questions.

Mr. LEAVY. Of the 435 Members of this House, I cannot for the life of me say this afternoon that any one is soldiering on the job that he has, and I do not believe that you can gather together in America anywhere the same number of men and women as constitute this House and find a more serious-minded, a more patriotic, more intelligent, and industrious group than we find in this American Congress.

I wish the American people would come to a full appreciation of the earnestness with which their Representatives seek to serve them. I can say this, because I am not a candidate for reelection this year.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. It delights me a great deal to hear the gentleman say this, because he can say it properly, not being a candidate for reelection, and also because he is a gentleman of sound judgment.

ment. His distinction and view of what constitutes loyalty and patriotic devotion to public duty is of the highest order, and I want to thank the gentleman for saying exactly what he has said. I find a great deal of expression from those outside, that Members of Congress are simply sitting here playing politics, everything they do being done with the idea of gaining votes. The gentleman's statement just made will go far toward clearing up that very erroneous conception in the public mind.

I wanted to ask the gentleman a question. That is why I rose. Does the gentleman not feel that the difficulty we have with the Department of Agriculture appropriation bills and Department of the Interior appropriation bills arises largely out of the fact that what we pay out of the Public Treasury is so very evident, and what comes in, or what the Nation gets in return, is not always so very evident? For instance, I have heard gentlemen say there ought to be cuts made. The gentleman who just preceded you mentioned several. He mentioned the Grazing Division. It may be that there is a certain item in the bill for the Grazing Division, but if I remember rightly the chairman of the subcommittee earlier today stated that more than \$1,000,000 income from that Division was received annually.

Mr. LEAVY. That is right.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is something which the public is overlooking. What the gentleman failed to mention this morning is the fact that not all of the receipts from grazing go into the Public Treasury. A share of it goes into the local treasuries, which is overlooked.

Mr. LEAVY. The gentleman is correct in his statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will not take more of the gentleman's time, but I do feel that we have a great asset in our partly developed West. Those States out yonder in the Rocky Mountain area, beyond the Mississippi River, serve as a source of supply not only for the needed things of today but for the future. They are the raw-products States. They constitute the national treasure chest. We must take care of our stewardship that we do not waste that heritage of the Nation, and it can be wasted by neglect.

Mr. LEAVY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to compliment and thank the gentleman for his part during the past 5 years in taking care of that stewardship so well by his actions in this committee and in the House.

Mr. LEAVY. I thank the gentleman for the splendid contribution he has made with reference to the functions of the Interior Department.

This year for the first time we had a new chairman of the Interior Department subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, JED JOHNSON. I feel that it is due him to state that I do not believe any chairman of any subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in the history of the Congress has devoted himself more faithfully, patiently, and carefully to a consideration of the responsibility than has the able and distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The attitude of the entire committee was to economize, was to reduce, was to make cuts. My own considered and deliberate opinion and judgment is that this bill has been cut beyond a degree where it should have been. It has been cut to the point that certain essential activities of Government are going to suffer, and unless some of those cuts are restored, either by this Committee or when this bill reaches the other body, a most important agency in our American system of Government—the Interior Department—in the most critical time of our Nation's existence, is going to suffer, and suffer substantially.

I know there are certain personal feelings that reflect themselves, sometimes improperly so in my judgment, in the matter of writing an appropriation measure. I know there are some Members here who do not have the same acquaintanceship, the same knowledge of the able and distinguished Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, that I do, who believe that cuts should be made, merely because that individual heads the Department. For my part, I am glad to say that even though there may be times when the Secretary would appear to be very direct, in my judgment he is one of America's great men, and he heads one of the great departments of this Government.

Harold Ickes is an intelligent, able, forceful, courageous, and patriotic man. In all that he has done—and he has done much for the great West—the breath of scandal has never touched his garments. The department he heads has spent billions of dollars—not millions but billions of dollars—since 1933. Some of us may differ with the wisdom of the expenditures, but no man can stand upon this floor or anywhere else and challenge the integrity of the man who has directed the expenditures, Harold L. Ickes.

I want to pay passing tribute to the clerk who prepared these hearings. They are splendidly indexed and well edited. For the first time a young man in the Appropriations Committee, who in keeping with the best traditions of the clerical staff of that committee, Bob Williams, had charge of editing these hearings, and is entitled to great credit; he did his work under the able direction of Jim Scanlon, editor in chief. Then, of course, the clerk of this committee, Bill Duvall, to whom we all turn for information and advice, is always entitled to commendation.

I am particularly interested in reclamation, and I will tell you why. I have only one small Federal reclamation project in my district. It is a very insignificant one. Six years ago when I was assigned by the then chairman of the Appropriations Committee to the Interior Department subcommittee, I was told by that chairman that from that time on, so long as I remained here, he wanted me to become familiar with reclamation and to take the laboring oar in connection with it. That was our much beloved and great chairman, Ed Taylor. I have tried to be faithful to the responsibility he imposed upon me. I have tried to familiarize myself fully on that subject.

I have tried to view reclamation not as a matter affecting my district or my State, but as one affecting the entire United States, and I have sought, beyond the understanding of some of my colleagues on the committee to get more liberal allowances for reclamation, because I could see in it not alone the development and salvation of the great West, but in large measure a great contributing factor to making America great and powerful as she is at this time.

This year reclamation, so far as bringing water to arid acres is concerned, is dreadfully curtailed; I think injuriously and harmfully curtailed. I believe the wisest thing we could do would be to add \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 for reclamation of lands, insofar as it could be carried on, where priorities are not involved, because every agricultural commodity that is going to be produced in the West is certainly going to be needed in this next year. Reclamation has been reduced very largely to only a development of projects that have to do with increasing the electrical energy output of the Nation. I fortunately come from a district that has within it the greatest power project in all the world. I refer to Grand Coulee Dam. For 6 years I have worked earnestly to see it fully completed and I have had splendid support. It is now about completed. The dam itself is finished, two giant generators are turning now—each of them producing enough electrical energy to take care of the needs of a city of 300,000 people. If the appropriation carried in the pending bill is allowed, within 2 years seven additional generators will be installed. An additional powerhouse is being built on the east side of the dam that will house 9 more of these mighty giants. I am proud of my contribution to this unusual project. All reclamation has been taken out of the Grand Coulee project for the time being. Donald Nelson, Chief of the War Production Board, has carefully examined the estimates for Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and those involving the other major power projects. In these hearings you will find his letter in response to one by the chairman written last week, stating that it was his considered and deliberate judgment that every one of these projects should move forward as rapidly as possible because of the part they play in the war effort. He also recognized their right to priorities. So I am trusting at least that the members of this committee will not reduce these items. I say to you that if you feel the urge of economy upon you so strongly that you must cut them, you had just as well cut them out entirely and assume the whole responsibility for it insofar as it would hinder our war effort. We know what will take place: They will be transferred, as they will have to be, because the needs of the Nation are such that they cannot get along without them—transferred to the War Department, the Navy Department, or some new agency, and the cost of administration would likely go up manifold.

On other reclamation projects—those in California I have in mind particularly—there are some slight increases made. In my judgment the increases to bring additional land here are wise

and essential. I disagreed with changes that affected power projects on Central Valley, but I am not going to take time to discuss that at length now.

Reclamation is about 30 percent of this whole bill, and nearly all of that deals with power. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking Member on the minority side, said that Bonneville ought to be cut further in the item "marketing." Let me tell you something about this, because it will undoubtedly come up tomorrow—something in connection with this item of "marketing." It does not stand alone any more than travel pay as it appears through these various bills is travel expense standing alone.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. Travel pay includes per diem in practically every instance. The same here for the Bonneville item that has been designated "marketing." It is the operation and maintenance of hundreds of miles of lines and scores of great substations. To cut those down beyond that which is wise is merely to make useless great facilities that must operate 24 hours a day, because 40 percent of the aluminum production in the next year is going to come from out in the region supplied by the power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee, and it would be a matter of short-sightedness and foolishness to reduce them. It would be a national calamity.

Reference was made to grazing. Grazing, of course, cannot be directly tied in to national defense, but it is certainly a second line of defense. Do you know that the grazing agency of this country has to administer 200,000,000 acres of land? And do you know that our beef production and our wool production is dependent on how that great estate is administered?

Reference is made to the Park Service. I agree that under existing conditions perhaps it should be reduced over what it was last year. Now do you realize that the Park Service has been reduced from \$14,000,000 for the current year to \$5,000,000 for next year? Would you ask a further reduction without a very careful consideration?

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that there was not a great amount of discord on the part of the subcommittee in the writing of this bill. We discussed matters pro and con at great length, but we gave serious, careful, earnest consideration to every item, and, as I said a moment ago, we cut some beyond what they should have been cut, in my opinion. If you propose a further cut, be sure that you familiarize yourself with the facts surrounding that particular activity and can say with a degree of certainty that you should possess that there ought to be further cuts made. Likewise, if you propose an increase you ought to be able to prove that, too, by the facts.

We, this committee, your agents, have done the best we could in writing the bill here, and I hope that no Member, for the mere satisfaction of saying, "I tried to

cut it again," will come in and attempt to reduce a bill that has already been cut 40 percent.

I want to make this assertion—and I challenge anyone to deny it—that 50 percent of the amount in this bill for the next fiscal year goes to national defense. If you cut those items, then wait a few days when we will have a seventeen-and-one-half-billion-dollar national defense bill in here, and fine-tooth comb that a little.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman is to be congratulated on the 40-percent reduction; also, I understand that the careful work of the committee in combining through this appropriation has eliminated approximately 25 percent of the travel amount. Would the gentleman be good enough to insert in the RECORD the comparative figures for 1942 and 1943? Because of the great reductions made in the bill below the Budget, it is impossible to know exactly how much of this appropriation will be allocated to travel.

Mr. LEAVY. I will be delighted to do that. It is as follows:

Comparative statement of appropriations and estimates for travel and amounts recommended in bill

Bureau or office	Estimated obligations for travel		
	Appropriations for 1942	Budget estimates for 1943	Amounts recommended in bill for 1943
Office of the Secretary.....	\$442,945	\$315,257	\$203,956
Commission of Fine Arts.....	5,100	5,100	2,500
Bonneville Power Administration.....	320,000	477,000	320,000
United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands.....	38,000	8,000	6,000
General Land Office.....	250,740	180,490	160,350
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	627,034	605,049	502,740
Bureau of Reclamation.....	227,564	193,905	151,308
Geological Survey.....	436,954	278,107	251,557
Bureau of Mines.....	308,035	426,882	387,933
National Park Service.....	110,816	380,660	68,500
Fish and Wildlife Service.....	378,482	306,669	255,769
Government in the Territories.....	21,573	30,073	25,350
Total.....	3,138,143	2,907,292	2,335,963

	Amount	Percentage
Reductions by committee:		
Under 1943 Budget.....	\$571,329	19.6
Under 1942 appropriations.....	802,180	25.5

I thank my colleagues for so patiently listening to me, and I trust I have helped, at least in a small way, to a better understanding of this important bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

CHAMPION BOONDOGGLE OF 1935 BLOSSOMS INTO COMMON PARKING LOT IN 1942

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, the champion boondoggle of 1935, the projected \$30,000,000 Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis is about to blossom forth in 1942 as a common

parking lot. This I predicted years ago. Many of the Members present will no doubt recall the early history of the project. You will remember that when we were asked to pass the joint resolution creating the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, we wrote into the resolution a disclaimer of any responsibility on the part of the United States.

At that time the proponents of the resolution disclaimed any intention of coming to Congress for funds, and technically they have kept that promise. However, the ink was hardly dry upon the President's signature making the resolution a law before the promoters were looking for some way to hook the Government, so it came to pass that in the spring of 1935, Architect Louis Le Baume, acting for a group of St. Louisans, applied to the Public Works Administration for a loan and grant of \$22,015,000. This original application catalogued as Missouri Docket No. 1006, was turned down when the engineers reported:

The proposed project has social desirability but cannot be classed as a public necessity.

Meanwhile the citizens of St. Louis were given all kinds of assurance the memorial was sure to be built at once. Mayor Dickmann promised to "have the dirt flying on the river front in 10 days," if only the people would cooperate and vote some local money at the special election to be held on September 10, 1935.

In spite of all these wild promises, the election did not attract the people, and we were not surprised to find out later that a favorable return for the bond-issue proposals had been obtained by frauds in every ward in which the proposals carried.

After the September 1935 election, Mayor Dickmann hustled down to Washington to get \$22,500,000 in Federal funds for the project, as he had promised the people he would do.

But when Attorney General Cummings held that this sum could not be allocated for the project, because it was not available, Mayor Dickmann retired from the Washington scene, but only for a few days. Then he returned and pulled every conceivable string, until, finally, the President, by Executive order, allocated \$6,750,000 of Emergency Relief funds to the project, to be matched by \$2,250,000 of the funds of the city of St. Louis.

Thus the project was whittled down from \$30,000,000 to \$9,000,000. But the promoters did not whittle down their appetites one iota. They kept right on promoting, and so it came to pass the Government finally acquired all of the projected site, 37 blocks in all, by condemnation, over the protests of many of the property owners, evicted some of the tenants, and during 1939 and 1940 they wrecked the buildings and spent nearly all of the Federal and the contributed funds as well.

So here we are in 1942 looking over the wreckage of what was started here in 1934. What was once a busy commercial and manufacturing section of downtown St. Louis is today only a wind-swept waste of broken bricks and mortar

which the National Park Service is trying to cover up with earth and clay hauled to the site and distributed with W. P. A. workers.

The \$9,000,000 has nearly all been spent, and when June 30, 1943, comes around I predict it will be more than spent if the Budget figures are correct. Yet the memorial is as far away as Mrs. O'Leary's stable and cow pasture is from the heart of Chicago, which I suggested might just as well be restored.

Mr. Chairman, last week I learned that National Park Concessions, Inc., a non-profit organization working with the approval of the National Park Service, is conducting a survey of the parking situation in St. Louis to determine whether or not to establish a temporary parking lot on the memorial site. Think of it—a parking lot on this \$9,000,000 site. Now, this is the same corporation that operates concessions at Mammoth Cave, in Kentucky. I would like to suggest that in their survey of the St. Louis situation they also study the past history of this famous boondoggle, with a view to working out some kind of a side agreement with former Mayor Dickmann and the rest of the memorial promoters, whereby a little space in Mammoth Cave might be reserved for these gentlemen in which to shed their tears and hide their disappointments.

At that, some of them must have gotten more than they expected after the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the St. Louis Star-Times exposed the corruption in connection with that special bond-issue election in September 1935. But our officials here in Washington were not interested in the ethics of the matter, so St. Louis got its memorial, fraud and all.

Now, what did they get? Nothing much to brag about. The city lost the income from all the taxable property in the area, and, besides, have to pay the annual interest on the \$2,250,000 worth of bonds that were sold to make up the city's contribution. The Federal Government is out \$6,750,000 for the property and will have to pay the interest on this money for many years to come.

So I say this was the champion boondoggle of 1935, for everybody lost, and not even Thomas Jefferson has been glorified.

Watch this champion boondoggle now blossom into a common parking lot. And let us resolve to write "finished" to its career here as far as appropriations go.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER].

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to discuss what to my mind is a very serious situation which involves Stephen, or H. S. Raushenbush, chief of the Research and Planning Section of the Power Division of the Department of the Interior, whose salary is included in this appropriation bill, and which vitally affects the very fabric of free enterprise in America.

On December 1, 1941, in a speech on the floor of the House I charged Mr. Raushenbush with being a Socialist-Communist, and a draftsman of the blueprint of communism for America, and I quoted from

a statement which I charged Raushenbush made to a group of Communists and Socialists.

Mr. Raushenbush took exception to this statement and wrote me denying that he was either a Socialist or a Communist and stated that in the speech I referred to he spoke as a liberal to a gathering of liberals and Socialists. Parenthetically it is a known fact that actual members of the Communist Party can and do publicly disavow membership—whether Raushenbush was and is an actual member of the party is immaterial. Communism is not only a political party in America but a political theory with as many shades of pink as Joseph's cloak.

Rather than injure an innocent man I looked up Raushenbush's history. I have his life story—chapter and verse—and he adheres to the theory of communism whether he belongs to the party or not. He is one of the original and principal architects of the so-called new order. His long-time aim is the destruction of the profit system—free enterprise—the American way of life. His immediate objective, admittedly, is the destruction of the major sections of our industrial system beginning with the production of electric power.

In this book, *The Socialism of Our Times*, published in 1929, Raushenbush wrote:

While the long-time aim of the liberal and radical groups is the abolition of the profit system for private use, our present strategy should be to make and take every opportunity to prove that there is something better than the profit system. Within the next 10 years we are going to have a chance such as we have not had for the last 40.

Raushenbush differs, not as to objectives, but only as to methods by which these objectives can be obtained in liberty-loving America. According to his own words, he long ago realized that the frontal assault by violence in the United States could not obtain the objective of a Communist state and with confessed reluctance abandoned the idea of overturning the Government by bloodshed and violence by which the minority would impose its will on the majority, for the more practical approach to the Communist state by means of "encroaching control."

Listen to what Raushenbush wrote and which is recorded on page 83 of this book, *The Socialism of Our Times*:

The very subject Transitional State implies that we have accepted the alternative of encroaching control in place of the dream of cataclysmic socialism which has engrossed people dissatisfied with the world for so many years. * * * It is not pleasant to give up that dream of violent triumph. We are sensitive about it.

Despite his reluctance to abandon a violent triumph he urged his proposed technique of encroaching control as more practical to the American nature of things than the method adopted by the murderers of the Kremlin in 1917. He advised his fellow travelers to lay aside the dream of violent triumph—revolution and civil war, if you please—merely on the grounds that it is not, and I quote his own language, "pragmatic."

He urged a Uriah Heap system of worming from within since he recognized that neither bullets nor ballots could persuade the American people to depart from free enterprise and democracy and adopt the totalitarian scheme of the Marxian state.

No; Raushenbush never actually joined the Communist Party—so he says—but few more energetic, few more clever operatives ever sought to destroy the America of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln than he. His whole life record is that of an ardent, clever—and I might add "slick"—worker for the Marxian dream of a Communist state in the United States. I charge that he believes in communizing America and is doing his subtle best to achieve that end.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. From where does this gentleman hail?

Mr. WINTER. I do not know where he hails from, but I know where he is working. He is in the Interior Department, Power Division; Chief of the Power Division of the Department of the Interior of the United States Government.

Mr. RICH. Where did he make those statements that the gentleman is referring to?

Mr. WINTER. He made one of them in a speech he was making to a group of liberals and socialists, as he says, in New York City, and the second that I quoted he wrote in this book.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is quoting from him?

Mr. WINTER. Yes.

Mr. RICH. He has made some very bad statements and it seems to me the F. B. I. ought to investigate that gentleman.

Mr. WINTER. They certainly should, and he should not be on the pay roll.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. I know the gentleman wants to be accurate in his statement of facts that are within his knowledge to ascertain. He states that Mr. Raushenbush is Chief of the Power Division?

Mr. WINTER. I beg your pardon. The research and planning division of the Power Division.

Mr. LEAVY. I know he never appeared before our committee.

Mr. WINTER. That is true. He is chief of the research and planning section of the Power Division of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. LEAVY. So far as I know the Chief of the Power Division is a perfect gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that the majority side of the House should call a special meeting of our subcommittee, call that gentleman before us and find out whether these statements are true. If they are, it seems to me the responsibility is on us and if he is down there

in that department advocating those things we ought to write something in this bill that will eliminate him from the Department of the Interior.

Mr. WINTER. Raushenbush is on record as supporting political ownership and political operation of all basic industries, of which electric utilities would be the starting point. If that is not communism what is it? Call it Marxianism, call it socialism, or give it a dash of eau de cologne and call it industrial democracy, it remains the same, the death of free enterprise which is the good right arm of democracy.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks about free enterprise. Does not the gentleman think these natural monopolies must be controlled?

Mr. WINTER. I certainly do. I think they should be controlled, but I do not think they should be taken over lock, stock, and barrel, and have everybody working for the state.

Mr. WHITE. Is there any other way of controlling them except through Government control?

Mr. WINTER. I do not care to argue that with the gentleman here. I should like to finish the remarks I have to make.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. WINTER. As long ago as 1927 Raushenbush, in the New Leader, the then official Socialist newspaper of the Socialist Party in America, speaking of the electric industry wrote:

Here is an industry in which \$8,000,000,000 are invested already and another billion is added every 2 years. We have made three attempts at control * * *. A fourth attempt, which I look upon as much more hopeful, is the one which seeks to set up through Government ownership at Muscle Shoals, at Boulder Dam, and on the St. Lawrence, yardsticks by which the efficiency of private ownership under regulation may be measured.

Elsewhere in this same article Raushenbush wrote:

We cannot hope to take over the whole \$8,000,000,000 industry successfully, even if it were generally thought advisable to do so at the moment. * * *. But a scattered series of great generating plants selling their power within 300-mile radiuses might be expected to have a very considerable influence upon the extension of public ownership to the transmission lines and the whole industry.

In another paragraph in this same article Raushenbush wrote:

Our long-time aim is the abolition of the profit system for private use. Our strategy is to make and take every opportunity to prove that it works. We must force our experts on agriculture, trusts, coal, power, subways, housing, milk, etc., to tell us correctly which the next steps are, and then take them and identify ourselves with their success.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Where did he make that statement, in New York also?

Mr. WINTER. Yes. That is one of the statements he made before this So-

cialist and Communist group, that I charged he was making, and he said he was speaking to liberals and Socialists.

Mr. RICH. What prompted him to make those statements? Does the gentleman believe that is his belief?

Mr. WINTER. I think he believed what he was writing. His whole life history goes along this same line. He was speaking to a group of liberals and, he says, Socialists.

Mr. RICH. He is down in the Department of the Interior under Secretary Ickes?

Mr. WINTER. Yes; right now.

Mr. RICH. We, as Members of Congress, permit these Communists to infest the bureaus. Evidently the responsibility seems to be ours. I am going to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he will not call a special meeting of our subcommittee and call this Mr. Raushenbush before us, and I hope we can get these statements.

Mr. WINTER. You certainly can. You can have them any time and many more.

Mr. RICH. We should ask him and find out whether these are his ideas. If they are, it seems to me it is about time that we clean up this Government and clean it quickly, before they clean us up and cause us to lose our form of government and our liberty.

Mr. WINTER. I hope the gentleman can be successful.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I want to question the statement of the gentleman from Idaho that electricity is a natural monopoly. Coal and natural gas are, but electricity is made; it is not a natural monopoly.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. Does not the gentleman now feel that Boulder Dam, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and even the T. V. A., with its various dams, are a godsend to the Nation and a blessing in this hour of trial?

Mr. WINTER. I think they are one of the finest things we have. I am not arguing that point at all.

Mr. LEAVY. The gentleman does not mean to advocate that they should be turned over to the private power companies?

Mr. WINTER. I am not arguing that point here at all.

Mr. LEAVY. The gentleman would not advocate that?

Mr. WINTER. No, I never have.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman know anything about the book Mr. Raushenbush wrote entitled "The March of Fascism"?

Mr. WINTER. He sent it to me and asked me if I would read it. I have gone through about half of it. It is a very, very illuminating document. If the gen-

tleman would like to borrow it, I should be glad to let him have it and read it.

Let me quote further from Raushenbush:

In this same New Leader article Raushenbush explained why the violent triumph, that he is so sensitive about giving up, is not a pragmatic approach to communism in America. He wrote:

We have no caste system in this country. We do not have quite the inferiority complex of the European workers upon which to found our philosophy. The workers of this country are climbing through marriage, the education of their children, and the like, out of the proletariat as rapidly as they can go about the business. * * * The chances are against the amalgamation in the near future of these various class struggles into one against the whole profit system.

In other words, free enterprise and democracy are so successful in this country that the public just is not interested in communism, so the new order must find a way to make America over in the Communist pattern without the people of the Nation being any the wiser until it is too late.

Mr. Raushenbush, years before the New Deal came to power, preached adoption of a method of achieving the planned state in America without resort either to the violence of bullets and bayonets which had proven successful in Russia or to a coalition of voters which proved sufficiently successful in France to cause the political confusion which led to the defeat of that nation.

Raushenbush always rejected both bullets and ballots as a means to overthrow the American way of life. He said neither method was practical to the American scene. He advocated the Uriah Heep method of boring from within. He suggested that all young liberals coming from colleges, avoiding formal membership in radical party organizations, should infiltrate into the service of the Federal Government and by the process of promotion obtain key positions from which they could wreck the American system of free enterprise. He proposed that the first key industry to be wrecked and taken over by the Federal Government must be the electric-power industry.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I wonder if the gentleman from Washington would subscribe to the doctrine as advocated by this gentleman of taking over all industrial enterprise.

Mr. LEAVY. I do not think I should be called upon to subscribe to any other person's doctrines. Frankly, I do not think this is the place where we can try people, but if the House feels that it should pass upon the reputation, character, and philosophy of some particular individual, that is a matter for their concern. I frankly tell you that I believe those great projects we have in the West—

Mr. RICH. That is not the question I asked. I am asking whether the gentle-

man subscribes to the doctrine of taking over all industry, as advocated by this gentleman.

Mr. LEAVY. In the first place, I do not know whether that is that man's doctrine or not. That is not my doctrine and I do not subscribe to it.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has answered the question. I am glad to know it is not his doctrine. It is not mine, either.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. May I point out that last year the Department of Justice in the Department of Justice appropriation bill had \$100,000 of the funds for the F. B. I. earmarked for an investigation of all subversive people and groups in all the departments. If you look at the hearings on the Justice Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943 you will find that the F. B. I. has made a report, and this man may be in the report, but the Attorney General of the United States has stood in the way of the Congress getting that report. We could then act intelligently without having to try people on this floor. We are being thwarted by the Attorney General of the United States by his keeping Mr. Hoover, the F. B. I. Director, from giving Congress a report. This is the reason it is necessary for the gentleman to take the floor to expose the philosophy of this Mr. Raushenbush among many others, and in passing I may say that in 189 cases where the F. B. I. sent reports to the department heads, they received no replies. In 11 cases only did the department heads dismiss such employees.

Mr. WINTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I think the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] will be delighted to hear your honest opinion because it is not often we have a man who is not running for reelection from whom we can get the low-down from a good legal mind.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I want to say to the gentleman I agree with what he is saying about this matter and I cannot understand how we can get away from this statement. Just let me read you this sentence which I do not think the gentleman has read, in which he says:

We have to give up our dream—our dream—of a violent overthrow of the Government.

I do not know what kind of a doctrine it is that a man preaches, I do not care where he is, that man ought not to be in the service of this Government and there is no question about it, unless he can show that he has changed entirely. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Kansas 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I repeat, unless he can show that he has changed his sentiment since he wrote this in 1929.

Mr. WINTER. Those are my sentiments exactly and I am glad to hear the distinguished gentleman make that statement.

Mr. BULWINKLE. And this was copyrighted in June 1929.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That was perhaps before he had a position in the Government. They are not so anxious to overthrow the Government once they get on the inside.

Mr. WINTER. I think that is true.

Once all manufacturing and most of the transportation and commercial life of the Nation became dependent upon the Federal Government for its lifeblood, electric power, a few shrewd officials in control of that power would find easy the bureaucratic conquest of the balance of the free enterprise economy of America, the Siamese twin of our free democratic system, the one of which cannot live without the other.

One of the most significant paragraphs from the Raushenbush outline for a sneak attack on free enterprise and the American way of life is to be found on page 86 of this book *The Socialism of Our Times*, when he wrote:

The students coming from the colleges today can do something more than be filled with wholesome and cleansing indignation. They can be of enormous use to the movement as Government officials, starting in small and definitely working on the reasonable hope that in the course of another 10 years we shall have Government control of a much more definite kind over our trusts, banks, and general industries; that there will be Government corporations operating and managing, not only the Port of New York and Muscle Shoals, but many other developments. There is a chance here for young men not only to keep the liberal groups informed about the dirty work going on and times and ways to prevent it, but also to look forward to careers of usefulness in executive positions, making the Government control over industry more adequate, pioneering in a field of essential importance.

And then further on, on page 86, is one of the most startling remarks of the whole article, in the light of the present key position Raushenbush holds as Chief of the research and planning section of the Power Division of the Department of the Interior:

One good man with his eyes, ears, and wits about him, inside the Department—whether it be the Interior where the oil scandal started and the Boulder Dam bill received most active support, or the Treasury, where the taxation scandals breed and the Government tax policies originate—can do more to perfect the technique of control over industry than a hundred men outside.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask the gentleman if this has ever been brought to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior, or does the gentleman know?

Mr. WINTER. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I say he is pretty busy in the egg business?

Mr. WINTER. And then on page 85 of this book we find Mr. Raushenbush making this astounding statement:

This side of revolution (Russia, Italy, and Germany) we can only take what opportunities we can make ourselves or are offered for illustrations in socialist practice to convince both the workers and the middle class that we are right, that the abolition of the profit system is to their interest and will result in higher real wages, greater security, freedom from wars, and other forms of autocracy.

I wonder if he has changed his mind about the Fascist revolution since the day he wrote those amiable words?

Of course, since he presently disavows—as do 90 percent of all practicing Communists—his alliance with communism it must be embarrassing to him now to have his words, like birds of ill omen, come home to roost. I refer particularly to his quotation on the founder of communism, Lenin, as the shining exemplar for American "liberals," found on page 87 of this most illuminating document, wherein Raushenbush wrote:

The very idea of saying to people that you want Government ownership of railroads or electric power, not because it is eternally right, but because it is cheaper for the workers and can be so proved, will be halted by some as a compromise or betrayal of socialism. But, as I understand it, Lenin himself summed up each situation by itself and met it as he could, practically and pragmatically, and after that was done sat down to write these long, dry theses of rationalization proving that Engels and Marx would have agreed.

At one time Raushenbush was a member of the executive committee of a well-known Socialist transmission belt organization known as the League for Industrial Democracy. He admitted to me in his letter that during his college days he was a member of a college organization called the Intercollegiate Socialist Society.

Raushenbush says he is not a Communist, that he is not a Socialist, but by his own published statements he establishes himself as a lifelong radical, with brains and ability, who practices his own preachings of boring into key positions where the most damage can be done to the American system of free enterprise.

We, as Members of Congress, hold a sacred obligation to the boys who are fighting and preparing to fight to save the four freedoms outlined in the Atlantic Charter to preserve for them, until the time when they shall return to the ways of peace, that American way of life which is embodied in our system of free enterprise. Congress can help to discharge that obligation by refusing to appropriate funds to pay the salaries of high Government officials who, in the name of liberalism, are seeking to break down great segments of our democratic system of free enterprise.

A good deal of confusion exists in this country about the meaning of communism. Because there is a Communist Party in America which is dedicated to the establishment of a Communist state by means of violent overthrow of our Government, it is natural that we should think of all Communists as believing in attaining their objectives by such means. In truth, communism is not a political party, but a political theory.

The Communist Party of America, as such, actually represents a sort of denomination in the whole religion of communism. At the time of the Russian revolution there were two major denominations of communism in Russia. The larger group were the Mensheviks, who did not believe in bloody revolutionary methods. The small group of Bolsheviks used the Mensheviks for a while, then turned on them and destroyed them as ruthlessly as they destroyed the land owners. Here in America not 10 percent of those who believe in a Communist state belong to the Communist Party or believe in revolution as the means of achieving a Communist state in this country.

They have shelved the violent triumph method merely because it is not realistic or practical. They are men of cunning and they realize that they are so vastly outnumbered and that there is so little genuine sentiment for their cause in this country that a revolutionary attempt would be a puny, farcical failure.

They are not without a plan, an alternative solution by which they can achieve a communist state in this country. It is a "realistic" plan, to use their own expression, for achieving their end without resort either to bullets or ballots.

They plan to seed their fellow travelers throughout the Government and by administrative action and abuse of power, force the direction of Government further and further to the left, toward communism. They plan to plant their bright young men in key positions where, unnoticed, they can work their mischief behind the scenes. In the name of liberalism and of reform they plan to break down our democratic system of economy.

No matter by what name you call it, this radical concept which Raushenbush has advocated all his life can be carried out only as a planned state, owned and controlled by a self-perpetuating bureaucracy, which in turn must be ruled by an inner clique of superplanners who have at their head a diabolically clever man as the dictator, the tyrant in the classical sense, who will tell the American people where and how to live, what and how much to eat, what to wear, and what and what not to think; control their religious worship and dictate their economic life. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, free enterprise—all the freedoms which have made America the greatest Nation on the face of the earth—would disappear if a Communist state should be achieved.

Day by day, termites who believe and work for that kind of a Federal Government, hundreds upon hundreds of them, are now operating along a definite plan as paid officials of the United States Government. Associated with them in many of these activities are hundreds more who are innocent, ignorant dupes who are blind to the direction in which their activities are taking this Nation.

That the Communist state of Russia happens to be, by an accident of history, the war ally of the democratic state of America, has no bearing on this issue. Russia would resent and resist infiltra-

tion of democratic doctrines into the Kremlin with far more vigor than we in America resist Communist infiltration. All praise to Russian defense of their homeland since that defense aids our war effort. But let us have no false sentimentality toward an alien political philosophy just because they are our allies. We don't have to like their sour-cream soup just because we happen to be in the same war with them.

We, as Members of Congress, have given a solemn oath to preserve our American institutions. We are honor-bound in this time of national danger and travail to all of our constituents, whom we are asking to give of their treasure, their sons, their blood, and their toil, to preserve at home the freedoms for which our boys are fighting and laying down their lives to defend.

Certainly the least we can do is to see that not one dime of the taxpayer's money is appropriated to pay the salary of any saboteurs of democracy who are operating from within the framework of our Government to promote a political theory at the expense of the freedoms which this Nation is giving its life's blood to defend.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlemen will look at the hearings at page 40 they will see something of the appetite of bureaucracy gone wild before the first bomb dropped at Pearl Harbor. Great credit has been given to the Secretary of the Interior. I have no personal feeling against him at all—if no praise. I differ over policy and the way he does things; I differ with his method. Look at this figure here of how much the Secretary asked for before Pearl Harbor and think of it. I asked him:

Mr. JONES. Then the amount you requested (from the Bureau of the Budget) was how much?

Secretary ICKES. Our total request was for \$349,756,568.

I would like to have known what program they had in mind with that amount of money. A few pages later the Secretary in the hearings claims great wisdom for being able to foresee that the Presidential office should not have shipped oil and scrap iron to Japan. He was one of the first that went out over the highways and byways to get us into this war. So, as I look at his budget request of \$349,756,568, I would like to know what was in it. I wonder if the Secretary had a scheme to fill the Grand Canyon with beer by means of a bucket brigade.

I wonder if the Secretary of the Interior would have proclaimed Fish and Wildlife as a super national-defense bureau. He might then have spent money to make black-out pants for lightning bugs. Sure national defense is in some parts of this bill. It is hard to draw the line where seminational defense starts and where boondoggling stops. Even the shoe cobbler is in national defense. But MacArthur comes first.

Mr. Chairman, certainly we can put first things first, and we can deprive our-

selves of a lot of recreation in national parks, in favor of getting bombs and guns and tanks and equipment to our beleaguered forces throughout the four corners of the world. It is only a question of differing over points, and what comes first. I contend there is room for another \$15,000,000 cut in this bill, if we put first things first, and get the tanks and machinery and guns to MacArthur.

Now let us examine Mr. Ickes' cuts. It comes with poor grace, it seems to me, for the Secretary to wait until a near disaster comes over us at Pearl Harbor to say to the Budget Bureau, "You're a bunch of pikers; we will take a voluntary cut of \$10,000,000 more." I am thinking of another day a year ago. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] asked the Secretary if we could not cut out some of these same expenditures. He asked him particularly about the information service, and if the gentleman will look at the hearings last year they will see where Mr. Ickes was proposing to illustrate and dramatize the department by means of cartoons. Yes; he did that, but the little lion of the penthouse on C and Twentieth Streets NW. did not have the courage to ask for superman comics for his annual report this year. The test of a man's frugality is: What did he do before Pearl Harbor?

Let us take a look at the record and see what took place last year on the regular supply bill. The amount of the Budget estimates for the 1942 fiscal year was \$186,496,348. The amount of the bill as it passed the House was \$177,027,078. The amount of the bill as it passed the Senate was \$185,119,813. You can see when it left the House, the Senate, had a few ideas of its own on raising the House version of the appropriation for the Interior Department by \$8,000,000.

Some items in the House side were lower than the Senate side; and some of the Senate side were lower than on the House side, but the conference took the highest figures in each case and reported the bill back to the House and the Senate that was \$3,206,110 above the Senate version of the bill and \$11,298,845 above the House version of the bill, making a total conference bill of \$188,325,923.

Vainly a few of us on the minority side, especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I, tried to cut items from the bill. Not one cent were we successful in cutting.

Yes; there was loyalty on the part of the majority members of the committee—loyalty to the Secretary, belief in his program, and they were sincere about it; and I admire them for it, because he is a "Mouthful" of their party, but there was not one cent of cut. Every amendment was defeated, even to the amount of spending \$30,000 to put the Government into the park and hotel business in Alaska, where just a few patrons come to visit it.

I made a motion to recommit the bill when it was before the House, when it carried the sum of \$177,027,078. My motion to recommit would have sent the bill back to the committee with instructions to cut it to the 1941 appropriation of \$155,549,932.

Bear in mind that the 1941 bill only carried national defense items as claimed by the Department of \$38,875,400. For the benefit of those who might wish to

know what departments and agencies were claimed then as national defense, I wish to read to you the national defense items in the 1942 supply bill:

Appropriation items for national defense projects considered for the Interior bill for 1942

Appropriation title	Budget estimate	Approved by House	Approved by Senate
GENERAL OPERATIONS			
Bureau of Reclamation: Protection of reclamation projects.....			\$50,000
Geological Survey:			
Salaries.....	\$25,000	(1)	25,000
Topographic surveys (mapping for military use).....	987,500	(1)	987,500
Strategic and critical minerals.....	195,000	\$195,000	195,000
Total Geological Survey.....	1,207,500	195,000	1,207,500
Bureau of Mines:			
Mineral mining investigations (chromium studies).....	100,000	100,000	100,000
Economics of mineral industries.....	247,000	40,000	50,000
1. Scrap iron and steel statistics.....			
2. Cooperation with other American republics in production of strategic minerals.....			
Investigation of domestic sources of mineral supply.....	425,000	425,000	425,000
Helium plants and investigations.....	350,000	350,000	350,000
Manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research.....	930,000	930,000	930,000
Production of alumina from low-grade bauxite and alunite.....	85,000		85,000
Total, Bureau of Mines.....	1,937,000	1,845,000	1,940,000
Fish and Wildlife Service: Inquiry respecting food fishes (surveys of stream pollution resulting from defense activities).....	35,000		35,000
Government in the Territories: Construction, operation, and maintenance of roads, Alaska.....	50,000		50,000
Total, general operations.....	3,229,500	2,040,000	3,282,500
GENERAL PUBLIC WORKS—(CONSTRUCTION)			
Bonneville Power Administration: Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system.....	18,142,900	18,142,900	18,142,900
Bureau of Reclamation:			
Reclamation fund:			
Kendrick project, Wyoming.....			200,000
General fund:			
Boulder Canyon project.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Bullshead project, Arizona-Nevada.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	3,000,000
Parker Dam project, Arizona-California.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Central Valley project, California.....	11,250,000	7,250,000	4,250,000
Grand Coulee Dam project, Washington.....	6,000,000	3,000,000	6,000,000
General investigations.....			1,000,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	25,250,000	18,250,000	17,450,000
Total, construction.....	43,392,900	36,392,900	35,592,900
Grand total.....	46,622,400	38,432,900	38,875,400

¹ Eliminated by House committee with recommendation that necessary funds for mapping for military use be appropriated to the War Department.

² Includes supplemental estimate submitted to the Senate in the amount of \$7,000 for statistics on scrap iron and steel (S. Doc. No. 61).

³ Supplemental estimate submitted to the Senate (S. Doc. No. 61).

⁴ The Senate amendment reducing this item added a contract authorization in the amount of \$10,000,000 for this project.

⁵ Includes supplemental estimate submitted to the Senate in the amount of \$3,000,000 (S. Doc. No. 61).

⁶ A Senate amendment also provided contract authorizations totaling \$7,450,000 for several reclamation projects including the following amounts for projects involving power development: Colorado-Big Thompson project, \$1,500,000; and Boise project, Anderson ranch, \$500,000. Senate amendments also transferred construction and administrative expense funds totaling \$6,950,000 from the reclamation fund to the general fund, thus permitting construction to proceed more expeditiously on several projects involving power development which are related to the national defense program.

I would not be surprised but that real national defense is confined to these same bureaus in the 1943 bill. I do not think there is any doubt but what we have been boondoggled out of the difference between the \$38,875,400 claimed by the Department as national defense and the \$188,000,000 as passed by the adoption of the conference report of the 1942 Interior Department supply bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Am I to understand that all this praise which was showered upon the Secretary of the Interior this afternoon by the chairman of the subcommittee, that he had of his own free will volunteered a reduction of \$10,000,000 in the appropriation for the Department of the Interior, that involved

the \$349,000,000? Is that the figure he based his reduction on?

Mr. JONES. No. It is worse than that. Before Pearl Harbor Secretary Ickes asked for \$349,756,568. Then the Budget Bureau cut the amount down to a figure \$50,163,179 under the appropriations for last year. The Budget Bureau sliced \$161,818,467 from Mr. Ickes' pipe dream of \$349,756,568, leaving \$187,938,101.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Where does the \$10,000,000 reduction come in?

Mr. JONES. Then the \$10,000,000 was taken from \$187,938,101. You can see it on pages 4, 26, and 36 of the hearings. Then came the war, and Mr. Ickes has the effrontery to tell the Budget Bureau he is taking another cut of \$9,811,360. Then, in effect, the Secretary said to the Budget Bureau, "You are all wrong. You missed some of my boon-

doggie. I can find \$10,000,000 more you can cut."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That was some of this padding he had fixed up in the first place?

Mr. JONES. Then the committee received additional estimates of \$2,190,525 and you add that to \$178,126,000 and you see how the Budget estimate on page 47 of the report was arrived at. The committee cut \$17,682,421 from that and you have the amount of \$162,634,000 in round numbers in the bill before you for consideration.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. RICH. My colleague from Ohio [Mr. JONES] since he has been a member of this subcommittee, has been for cutting down these expenditures in government. One instance the gentleman might tell the House about is Secretary Ickes and his organization spending over three and a half million dollars in setting this country up in the sugar and rum business in the Virgin Islands, and then after they spent that money they incorporated for \$30. This last year they went in the red \$60,000 on a \$30 capitalization. That is some business enterprise.

Mr. JONES. You can refer to the hearings this year and last year. The gentleman has covered that each time in the hearings.

In addition to the amounts appropriated last year in the deficiency and in the regular supply bill, look at page 34 and you will see the amounts that have been transferred from other departments of Government, from the President's emergency fund, to bring the total amounts of funds in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, over and above the amounts that we appropriated to him.

On page 35 you will find the Ramspeck promotions carried in this bill are \$571,250. Turning to page 45 of the hearings you will see there the report of the cost of the Information Service. We maintain an Information Service at each of the branches of Government. They can give you information on anything except what they cost the Government—the taxpayers.

I tried last year to get the cost and if you will refer to the hearings, page 1139, last year you will find where they reported "information" cost for the Department of the Interior was \$76,530. This answer was given to the following question:

Mr. JONES. Would it be possible to put in the record a detailed statement of the cost of the entire Information Service of the Department of the Interior?

This year I took it up with them and I told them:

In regard to the Information Service of the Department of the Interior, last year I asked for a complete break-down showing the total cost of the Information Service, but I do not think the answer to the question was entirely comprehensive. It covered the personnel, but I want for the record a statement showing the paper cost, distribution cost, cost of messenger service, etc. I would like to get an answer to that question again this year, giving the entire or total cost. What

further need is there for this Information Service at this time, in view of the fact that after Pearl Harbor we have a united country?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JONES. If you will look at pages 44, 45, 46, and 185 of the hearings you will find very unsatisfactory answers as to the cost of the Information Service. On page 185 I am given a figure by Mr. Straus. Just listen how misleading it is. Mr. Straus says:

For the departmental information service which includes my office; the photographic section which services all of the 12 bureaus, such as the Bureau of Reclamation, the National Park Service, and so forth, and all of the service from publication section through which every item passes that goes from the bureau or any department to the Printing Office such as those standard forms and the other items; and also for the radio section serving all bureaus and the Department—the total was \$97,360.

That sounds like the "real McCoy." But let me give you the break-down that I have figured from letters that followed these unsatisfactory answers when I saw them appear in the hearings. I will give them to you. Just think of the time and effort it has taken to get this information.

For publications in the Department of the Interior it cost a total, for 369 man-years of personnel, \$879,379; other obligations, \$550,499; making a total for publications of \$1,429,878.

Now, we will turn to press service. For total personnel services, 30 man-years, salary \$64,898; other obligations, \$4,178; making a total of \$69,076.

For radio broadcasting, for 9.95 man years, \$28,612 in salaries; other obligations, \$3,929; making a total of \$32,541.

I will put in the RECORD a complete statement of the different categories from radio broadcasting, group contacts, paid advertisements, exhibits, motion pictures, lantern slides and like material, photography, correspondence, individual contacts, educational cooperation with schools; posters; making a total of \$1,765,471 for salaries, and \$665,306 other obligations, making a total cost of \$2,430,777.

Mind you, this is the kind of expenditure after Pearl Harbor. I tried to get figures for the current year—these are for the fiscal year 1941. The best and latest figures I could get are the ones I have submitted. I asked the Clerk to send down for them. They included those they were required by law to get out and then the press service sneaked in others as mimeograph operators. I still have not got a satisfactory answer I can analyze tonight. The total amount for personnel included in this exhibit is \$2,000,000 plus for publication and propaganda service. It covers a total of 115 full-time employees and 1,918 part-time employees. It took the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] a year and a half to get from the Bureau of the Budget the break-down of personnel as I have it here. The break-down of the figures given to me by the Department of the Interior does not show any such break-down, but shows a total of

man-hours, 723.3 for the entire Department, and in the field. There is a sample of the arrogance of the departments, and it shows you how far the bureaucratic tail of Government has gone in wagging the dog.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Can the gentleman by any stretch of the imagination see anything in the matters he speaks of that aids national defense?

Mr. JONES. I cannot think of a thing in it that aids national defense. The only thing this activity does is to disturb our people and put class against class in a power fight where public and private interests should unite to produce goods and guns for MacArthur's forces.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. For several years we have discussed the Jefferson Memorial. This year you will see from the testimony on page 43 of the hearings that the Park Service is still continuing to use city of St. Louis funds as trust funds to sponsor a W. P. A. project. This Congress let its mandate be known to the Department by saying that it did not want any more Federal funds spent on the St. Louis memorial project. The Park Service uses this subterfuge to get around the positive mandate of Congress; and by reading page 47 of the hearings you will find another case of the arrogance of the Department of the Interior where I asked the Secretary about the entertainment of British soldiers and sailors in the parks of the United States. The disquieting thing that stands out like a sore thumb in the answers to all these questions is that nobody knows when we get through with the examination who paid for this entertainment. I insist that the Secretary of the Interior or the head of any other department coming before our committees should answer fully and completely and not play hide-and-go seek with a Member of Congress whether he be a member of the majority or minority party. Mr. Ickes said—and I will put this in the RECORD more fully when I revise my remarks:

I do not think you need to explain that further, Mr. Burlaw.

I believe we are entitled to a full explanation at any time we want it.

Further taking up the matter of the publicity of the Department, we have \$2,430,000 now for publicity. You will find in the hearings at pages 108 to 114 a discussion of the Tugwell plan of resettlement of the Puerto Ricans. I asked Mr. Swope, of the Division of Territories, to furnish enough copies for each member of the subcommittee and several Members of Congress who had asked me for a copy, asked them to bring it with them when they came to testify the next morning. The next morning it developed that they had forgotten to get the report. Thus they could not be examined on it. They did bring up two copies in the afternoon when the testimony had been completed—two copies, one for the clerk and one for me.

The Solicitor's Office carries the sum of \$322,720. With the cuts that have been made in this supply bill it seems to me we ought to be able to cut his office considerably.

On page 145 you will find the Soil and Moisture Conservation item of \$1,300,000. This effort has been going on for a good many years, but in the interest of the war effort, certainly for 1 year we ought to be able to cut out this item in order to get equipment to MacArthur.

On page 324 of the hearings you will find that for the investigation of reclamation projects they are asking this year, the fiscal year 1943, for \$1,450,000.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is a lot of that money spent for printing these nice picture books that have been sent out all over the country?

Mr. JONES. I think it has.

Mr. TABER. To entertain the babies?

Mr. JONES. That is right, of all kinds. You will find in the hearings an entire and complete study of the park situation that was ordered before Pearl Harbor, and which serves no useful purpose now. It might just as well have been eliminated. It is now selling at the Government Printing Office for \$1.25 each. The point is, could we have gotten along without it, not how much you get for it.

I ask you to look at page 324 of the hearings. You will see there the number of projects that have been completed or will be completed with 1942 funds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, last year they had \$1,750,000 for investigations. They have a backlog of investigative work that covers somewhere around 17 States. With the funds already given them they have completed and have ready for construction \$453,197,784 worth of public works that they can go on with. The investigation is completed with reference to that amount. That is enough of a backlog for post-war work. We can cut the entire amount for investigations during the fiscal year 1943 and we can pick it up after the war is over if we see it is necessary.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What was the total amount that the gentleman stated?

Mr. JONES. \$453,197,784.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If you cut out that item you would throw some of these planners out of a job.

Mr. JONES. That is the whole issue, trying to save these fat officeholders who might go into productive war work, who might be designing tanks, and airplanes, and doing something for General MacArthur. They could be transferred to the Geological Survey to do topographic map work that is necessary for the War Department. But, no, they want to continue these investigations covering rivers in many States. You will find it all covered on page 326. It is not necessary, it

should be discontinued, and it will be a crime and a shame if there is 1 penny left in this bill for investigation in 1943.

On page 329 you will find the progress of the development of dams and power facilities, and I invite your attention to that item before we come to it tomorrow.

With the enormous amount of money we spent and will spend for the fiscal year 1942 for reclamation, guess how many acres of land have been brought into production as a result of that program? You will find on page 402 that 72,207 acres have been brought into production at a cost of \$99,667,000. How much does that cost an acre? Think of it.

Then you will find on other pages of these hearings where they tried to justify the continuance of these wide investigations on reclamation construction projects on the ground of taking up the slack of a billion and a half dollars of imports that come into this country from South America.

These are but a few of the kisses in the dark missed by the subcommittee. As we read the bill I will cover some of the other items.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, during the several minutes that I was out of the House Chamber I am advised that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] raised the question of loyalty to the American form of government with reference to one employee connected with the Power Division of the Department of the Interior. I am advised that he at first referred to him as the head of the Power Division, but later, I believe, corrected that part of his statement. I merely want Members to know that I never heard of the gentleman in question. I did not know there was such a person connected with the Power Division as the gentleman he mentioned.

The committee heard the head of the Power Division, Mr. Fordyce, who appeared before the committee and made a very fine statement. If the person mentioned by the gentleman from Kansas is actually connected with the Power Division, and I assume, of course, that he is correct, and if he is in any kind of responsible position and has written a book in which he has stated some things that are not in keeping with the ideas and ideals that Americans hold dear, then I would be the last person on earth to try to defend such a person. I have no love and very little patience with any American who would bite the hand that feeds him; who would accept a salary from our Government and at the same time advocate the overthrow of his Government. It occurs to me, however, that if the gentleman from Kansas had such information when the committee was in session, and I believe the statement was made that he had it for 3 months, it would have been the fair and reasonable thing to have apprised the committee of this information and at the same time given the accused an opportunity of being heard. That is the American way.

There are several thousand people working in the Department of the Interior. The committee, I know, will be glad to learn that the F. B. I. was invited to go through the Department of the Interior and make the same kind of an investigation it has made or will make in all of the other departments of government. I am not telling any secret when I say they have not yet completed that investigation, but they have completed it sufficiently that one employee of that Department has already resigned. I feel that Members have absolute confidence in the F. B. I. It will do a good job.

It has no friends to reward or enemies to punish. It will be fair and thorough. I think I can say to the House that when the F. B. I. report is made that the Department will act accordingly and without delay.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Might it not be fair to the gentleman under discussion to accord him even a chance to explain his side of the case without trying and convicting him in the House of Representatives?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I cannot believe that the House wants any ex parte or star-chamber proceedings here. The gentleman who has been mentioned so many times, it seems to me, should have been accorded the opportunity of appearing before the committee and presenting his side of the question

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes and ask him if he will yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. May I say that I never heard of this gentleman, I feel sure that the chairman of our subcommittee has not heard of him, and I do not believe that any member of our committee knows anything about him; but if the statements made by the gentleman from Kansas on the floor a few minutes ago are true, then the chairman of the subcommittee should call the committee together tomorrow morning at some convenient hour, we should invite that man to appear before our subcommittee, read the statement that was given here this afternoon, and find out whether he subscribes to those things or whether he has written them. If he did, we should then write something into this bill that would bar him from receiving any salary from the Department. I feel confident that the chairman of our subcommittee will do some such thing as that, give the man an opportunity, and then let us see whether we can correct such a situation as this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say to the gentleman that a far more practical method, and I am certain a more sure one, was adopted by the committee. May I call attention of the gentleman to the language of this bill. I refer the gentleman to page 140, line 13.

This is not a provision that refers to one person only; it speaks for itself:

Provided further, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. RICH. If he wanted to sign an affidavit that he did not subscribe to those things he has written, then he would evidently have changed his mind and he could get away with it, but I think we ought to know something about this, and I hope the chairman now, since we have started on this matter, will call the gentleman before our committee tomorrow morning and let us get the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may again assure the gentleman that the F. B. I. is taking care of the situation in that department, as it is in every other department of Government. When the F. B. I. finishes its investigation it is safe to say that the gentleman in question, as well as all employees, as well as the Congress, and the country will get a square deal—no more, no less.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. I wonder if the gentleman would consider calling on the Attorney General's office to make a report to us so that we may learn about their investigation in that Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would say to the gentleman that I have already asked the Department for a report and feel certain that the report will be forthcoming to the committee just as soon as this investigation has been finished. I think that is the fair, practical, reasonable, and businesslike way to do the job.

Mr. JONES. In order to satisfy this particular incident, would it be possible to get a partial report on those concerning whom they have already completed their investigation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not know about that, but I think the committee would like to see the entire job done. I assure the gentleman it is being done, and I am very hopeful it will also be done not only in that department but in every other department and agency of the Government within the next few weeks or months. As far as I am concerned, the F. B. I. cannot investigate them too quickly to suit me.

Let us bear in mind that we are considering an appropriation bill, and that this committee is not an investigating committee. If the House wants to appoint an investigating committee now or any other time to go into that department or any other department, that is one thing. But to stop now in the consideration of the pending Interior bill to make an investigation, and especially one without giving the accused this constitutional privilege of being heard, is too absurd to be given serious consideration.

Mr. RICH. Suppose we report him to the Dies committee and let them take him for a ride.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania might appoint himself as a committee of one to do so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] such time as he may desire.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I believe we are at what may be termed as "the fork of the road" in the prosecution of our war effort.

This Government, this Congress, and groups of people in all walks of life including industry, labor, farmers, business and all of them must determine whether we can carry on as we are now doing, in view of the critical situation with which our country is confronted.

Mr. Chairman, the United States of America is in the most crucial period of its history. The American way of life is being challenged. Our democracy is threatened. We are in the most bloody, the most ruthless war the world has ever known and, it has only just begun.

More than 2,000,000 of the flower of our manhood have been called into service of their country. Millions more will be called. Thousands have been sent to the four corners of the world, and thousands more are on their way. Many of them will not return. Billions are being spent for munitions and war equipment of all kinds and we don't have half enough. This and more is required to protect our country from a ruthless enemy that seeks to destroy our very civilization.

Mr. Chairman, in the light of the critical situation we find ourselves today, it seems to me we must be more realistic, more frank about it. We have got to face the facts as they are, here and now.

Mr. Chairman, the risk is far too great for the people of this country to expect to bring this war to a successful conclusion and at the same time hope to maintain all of the so-called social and economic gains.

Mr. Chairman, I believe those charged with the prosecution of this war as well as industry, labor, farmers, and everybody must come to a common realization and understanding that to save this country from disaster and to keep faith with the men who are on the battlefield, and on the high seas, and in the air, they must lay aside demands for personal gains and not spar for special advantage. We must realize the only way to save this country is through common sacrifice on the part of everybody everywhere.

Until we have a realization that all Americans, and I use the words in broadest significance, are willing to demand and accept less rather than more, and do it in good faith, we stand a chance of losing this war.

Nowhere in the world can you find more loyal and patriotic people than among the rank and file of American workmen and American farmers. They have a big responsibility. They are willing. All they really want is fair play and a chance to do the job. Industry is becoming better prepared every day.

War production must be increased to the very limit. Industry must not demand or have excessive profits. Labor everywhere will need to work longer hours. Farmers must produce more food. People, generally, whether in Government, in the shop, on the farm, or in the office, must realize demands for personal gains and profits must be submerged and secondary in this crucial hour. Our country's destiny will be determined by our actions in the immediate future.

Mr. Chairman, Congress can appropriate billions, which is only a start. People buy bonds—that is absolutely necessary, but the thing that really counts is transforming these dollars into the sinews of war.

Our attention has recently been called to glaring cases of individuals who seek to extort such profits. A contractor with an investment of \$35,000 is said to have made a profit of \$200,000 on a war contract last year. Profits as high as 75 to 100 percent have been reported. There is the case of an individual who formerly held high position in the Government, and who is engaged as an "agent" to procure war contracts for certain firms. He demanded a fee of \$700,000 for securing a big contract for a New York firm. Of course, these are exceptions, but the grabbing of huge profits must be curtailed.

Mr. Chairman, the taking of excessive profits by a Cleveland firm that was broke a year ago, as shown by a naval committee report, is not only inexcusable but absolutely scandalous. The president of the firm admitted that from profits on Government contracts he drew a salary last year of \$145,000. His secretary drew \$39,300 and \$949,000 was divided among other officers.

Mr. Chairman, such a thing is disgraceful. It should be stopped. The money, all of it, should be refunded and those who took it should be penalized.

Mr. Chairman, extravagance and waste must be stopped. To permit waste of the people's money cannot be excused. Waste is bound to lead to corruption.

Mr. Chairman, the Government in Washington, and all who have a part in it, should set the example for efficiency and economy.

We need to streamline bureaus and agencies according to the absolute needs of the hour. There are about 165 of these agencies. Many are valuable, but not necessary now. Activities of others can be reduced and expenses cut.

Do you know our Government spent more than \$150,000,000 last year just for traveling expenses of its executive employees in the departments. Some of it is needed, but not all of it—not now.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much need there is for the new temporary building on Pennsylvania Avenue being built at a cost of \$600,000 and known as Mellett's Madhouse. I am advised it will be a bureau of information and will house hundreds of additional employees who will give advice relating to war production for those seeking contracts. Why not use some of the many information bureaus that are already set up and not needed in the present emergency.

Mr. Chairman, the recent resignation of Mr. Guthrie, one of the officials in the War Production Board, calls attention to the possibility of officials who may have taken advantage of their positions for financial gain. I do not think that such a thing is the practice. I believe nearly all of them are of the highest motives, but such practice should not be tolerated for a minute. Such facts should be made known. Whether they are dollar-a-year men or whether they received \$10,000 or \$15,000, they should be discharged.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that because it is for the best interest of our country much information cannot be disclosed. Those charged with the prosecution of the war should be just as frank and fair as possible in providing information to the American people concerning our war effort, without disclosing facts that may be helpful to the enemy. The American people "can take it," good or bad.

Mr. Chairman, the question of politics has been mentioned a good many times recently. Mr. Speaker, the situation is far too serious and too critical for favoritism or political maneuvering outside or within the administration. Those charged with the grave task of guiding our ship of state in this terrific storm should call into the Government, regardless of politics, the very best and most capable men in our country, and give them responsibilities in the production line, or wherever they may be used, just as you would do if they were to go on the battle line.

Mr. Chairman, the Americans are deeply concerned, and rightly so. They are willing and glad to contribute their share, and more, but they want to be assured that all efforts are being used for war purposes and not for nonessentials or boondoggling purposes. They demand everything be done to provide implements and materials of war before it is too long—and too late.

Mr. Chairman, we must reexamine our situation—not as of a year ago, or last month or last week, but today. We are living in a blundering, bleeding world. Democracy is on trial. Our very civilization is threatened.

Mr. Chairman, all groups and all classes will have to work together with a realization that it is for a common cause—to save our country from disaster.

The obligation to our boys in Australia, in Burma, in the foxholes of Bataan, and on the high seas and in the air is a tremendous one. Anything less than the best we have got is not enough.

Mr. Chairman, the task is gigantic. It can be accomplished. It can be done when the American people, working together, accept the challenge of these boys by giving them everything we have got. Nothing less will suffice.

Mr. Chairman, the task is tremendous. America will emerge victorious, but it will take work, and sweat, and blood, and tears before it can be accomplished. Let us hope and pray it may not be too long.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I have noticed that certain forces are engaged

in an apparent attempt to discredit one of the most valuable agencies of the United States Government, the National Youth Administration. Their latest attempt is to show that this agency has in its possession a great quantity of machines and tools that could more profitably be used by war production industries.

Having been from the beginning an ardent supporter and admirer of the work of the National Youth Administration, I have made it my personal business to inquire into the merit of the attacks being made upon this organization, and I find the following are the facts: This agency does have a great quantity of machines and equipment, which it is using for the training of workers for war production industries as well as workers for the shore yards of the Navy and the arsenals of the Army. My inquiry also brings out that the N. Y. A., on the whole, began assembling these machines some 2 years ago—long before some other groups saw the necessity of doing the same. Rather than meriting the condemnation carried in these newspaper articles and in some of the comments of the Members of Congress, it seems to me that this agency deserves the sincere commendation of everyone who is sincerely interested in the winning of the war. There can be no doubt that any agency which has put together the vast number of work and training facilities which the N. Y. A. has done has achieved a herculean task.

My investigation discloses that most of the machines which the National Youth Administration has been able to rebuild and secure are excellent for training purposes but are not of the most modern type nor of the heavy caliber or amperage required by the industries having war contracts.

I am informed that defense training facilities of the National Youth Administration now in operation include the following mechanical shop units and work stations:

Type of production activity	Number of—	
	Shop units	Work stations
Total.....	1,670	38,817
Machine and metal working (total):.....	1,134	25,097
Machine shop.....	365	9,571
Sheet metal.....	328	7,048
Welding.....	207	6,117
Foundry.....	33	490
Forge and blacksmith.....	101	971
Radio.....	97	1,956
Electrical.....	44	612
Automotive maintenance and repair.....	163	2,900
Aviation services.....	27	1,103
Patternmaking.....	43	490
Other woodworking.....	97	2,800
Industrial sewing.....	65	3,859

Another aspect of this agency's work has been the wisdom and foresight that was shown in the location of these shops and training centers. I understand that they are located in every State in the Union and exist in the greatest number in those places where there are labor surpluses and the fewest opportunities for employment or training for war production industries. After completion of training, facilities were established by

this agency whereby these young people, from those sections of the country having labor surpluses and no war contracts, could be transported to sections having war contracts and a labor shortage, thereby making available a very valuable source of workers at critical points in the war production structure.

I do not wish to be understood as being opposed to giving every possible assistance to those industries producing needed war material. I feel that if any of the N. Y. A. equipment can be shown to have a more valuable use in any war production industry than it is now achieving in the N. Y. A. training program, then such industries should have priority in its use. In saying this, I am merely supporting the position that has been adopted by the National Youth Administrator from the beginning of the defense, and now, war program. This is clearly attested to by the statement of Mr. Sidney Hillman, head of the Labor Supply Section of the W. P. B., whose statement I quote as follows:

Several months ago National Youth Administrator Williams, in conferences with Labor Division officials, agreed to turn over any useful machine tools for defense production purposes, if the proper authorities decided such action was to the best interests of the production program.

Most of the tools held by the National Youth Administration are old, reconditioned, and largely unsuitable for war production.

On November 8, the Labor Division instructed all training agencies, including the National Youth Administration, to utilize machine tools available for training on a 24-hour basis. These instructions were deemed necessary because of the anticipated shortage in machine-tool operators. This shortage has since developed.

The attack upon this agency would have little or no public interest if it were not aimed at an activity which, on the record of its performance, is of vital importance in the war effort. We are all aware of the repeated statements that only part of our industrial plant is now in full operation due to the fact that properly trained and qualified workers, as well as a shortage of basic materials, makes the full employment of this machinery impossible. Therefore, the training of workers becomes one of the critical and vital elements of the production of the goods necessary for an offensive war. That the National Youth Administration has been making a significant and valuable contribution to our war effort is attested by every responsible official in the Federal Government. This could hardly be otherwise for last year approximately half of all those in the age group which N. Y. A. serves, who secured employment in private industry received their preemployment training in its work centers. In 1941 alone, 419,000 young people went from N. Y. A. projects into private industry, 210,000 of these are known to have gone into war industries. In addition, there were another 300,000 who quit projects before completion of training, for whom no records are available as to where they went to work. In one month alone, January 1942, 35,000 young people went from the training projects of the National Youth Administration into war-production industries.

From all the facts in this situation, I feel that we owe this agency a vote of commendation that it foresaw a great need, and, with incredible efficiency and drive, has moved heaven and earth to do its part in meeting that need. We now see that we need every agency that we have—the schools, the training-within-industry—Labor Division, War Production Board—and the facilities of the N. Y. A. to help in speeding up a supply of experienced and trained workers for the war-production industries. It would obviously cripple and retard the war effort, at this time, to do anything that would weaken, curtail, or limit the work of the National Youth Administration. The simple truth is that instead of crippling and weakening and limiting this agency, we need to facilitate its fullest possible operation.

The economy of its effort is obvious to everyone who will take the trouble to inquire into its cost of operation. In one State alone, there were approximately 12,000 persons in preemployment training for war-production industries, 9,000 of these are in the shops of the N. Y. A. The other 3,000 are receiving training in the schools and in industry and are receiving an hourly rate which approximates the beginner's rate of pay in industry, whereas the youth on N. Y. A. are receiving only 15½ cents per hour. The cost of training the 3,000 is between 250 and 350 percent more than the cost of training the N. Y. A. youth.

In addition, the N. Y. A. youth are producing needed parts for the shore yards of the Navy and the arsenals, 1 shop alone having produced 28,000 parts for the Navy shore yards in a period of 3 months.

I have elected to make this statement solely because of my interest in helping to win this war and in the interest of truth.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] such time as he may desire.

NO MONOPOLY OF PATRIOTISM

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Member from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], speaking in opposition to the attempt which is being made to do away with pay and a half and double pay, demanded by some of those who are working in defense industries and to end the un-American practice of permitting certain labor politicians and racketeers to force the patriotic American worker to stand and deliver before going upon a defense job, said (RECORD, 2834):

Their tactics serve to arouse discontent among Americans and to breed disunity, and thus to play the game that Hitler wants played and that cashes in the chips for him and his gangsters.

That statement by the Member from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] not only tends to breed disunity, but it does breed disunity. She charges those who insist that, in wartime at least, the un-American policy of compelling an American citizen to stand and deliver before he can work in defense of his country, with playing the game of Hitler.

That charge is false and the Member from New Jersey should know it is false. Even a woman's prerogative of scolding

and verbally spanking those who are near and dear to her is no excuse for such a statement. That sort of a statement assumes that the one who uttered it has a monopoly of patriotism, of good, hard common sense, and is never mistaken.

The Member from New Jersey may defend, if she wishes—for that is her right—those gangsters who charged \$57.50 to loyal Americans who wanted to work in the construction of the cantonments. She may defend, if she wishes—for that is her prerogative—those who have compelled members of their craft to stand and deliver as much as \$1,000 for membership in a union before they would be permitted to work.

She may defend, if she will, those who demand double pay for every hour worked on a Sunday or a holiday in defense of their country. She may follow whatever course she wishes, and the right of free speech, as practiced here in America, permits her on the floor of the House to slander and to vilify other people, presumably just as patriotic, just as intelligent, as is she. That same rule and the falsity of her charge permits the insertion of a statement of the facts on the same subject.

Those who insist that this Government act to protect those who desire to work without being compelled to join a union; those who insist that in time of war the Nation should not be compelled to pay a price and a half and a double price for all munitions of war manufactured on overtime or on holidays or Sunday, are just as patriotic, and some think more patriotic, than those who follow the opposite course.

The Member from New Jersey [Mrs. Norton] had quite a little to say yesterday about the percentage of employees who were working in various industries. She said nothing at all as to the amount of money which was paid for overtime or for work on Sundays and holidays. She made no statement whatever as to the added cost of our war efforts caused by the payment of a wage and a half and a double wage. She was silent as the grave on the question of the amount of money, the millions of dollars, which American workers have been forced by union officials to pay before they could take part in the defense of their own country.

She failed to call the attention of the House to the fact that the demand for the closed shop, for double pay on Sundays, is so unpatriotic that the rank and file in at least one union has repudiated those demands. In a controversy which involved 8,500 employees of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co and the Libby-Owens-Ford Co., which was pending before the War Labor Board, the Federation of Glass, Ceramic and Silica Workers of America withdrew its demand for time-and-a-half pay for Sunday work and for a union shop and for the check-off.

Action by another union, the Automotive Workers Industrial Union, which is not affiliated with either the A. F. L. or the C. I. O., whose members include employees of the Diamond T Motor Car Co., proves what every informed person

knew—that the rank and file was not behind many of the demands of the leaders. This union, according to the press, writing the President, said that failure of the national administrative agency to adopt a uniform labor policy has seriously affected the efficiency of the war production program. That union further wrote the President:

We also believe that dues-picketing, union raiding, labor pirating, the cessation of work over the question of a closed shop and other forms of sit-down strikes or slow-downs should be abolished during the war period.

The union further urged a 48-hour week, but did ask for pay and a half for work in excess of the 48 hours. The company and the employees manufacture trucks for the Army.

The common sense, patriotic action of those unions should bring home to the labor politicians and to those who speak for them the fact that the rank and file of American labor is willing to assume its share of the war burden and that it is time for those who seek political or financial advancement through special demands by insisting that special privileges be granted to a group are not supported by public opinion.

The statement of the Member from New Jersey in substance and to the effect that those who are advocating a national labor policy are playing into the hands of Hitler is equal only in its lack of foundation, in its tendency to promote controversy and disunity, by the statement made last week in New York by the recently appointed Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, L. Metcalfe Walling, when he said:

The Nazi propaganda machine is behind this whole movement to do away with wage-and-hour standards, although I cannot cite chapter and verse, and the newspapers have been taken in.

It is fortunate for Mr. Walling that he does not go about the country repeating that statement, for he could be confronted by hundreds of thousands of loyal, patriotic, two-fisted Americans, who know that his statement is absolutely false.

It would be well for him to take a trip of a few days throughout the country and ascertain the will of the people. Let him talk with a few mothers, fathers, brothers of those who have gone to war, and let him in person tell them that they are the tools of Hitler. He will have on his hands a little private war of his own. His appointment has apparently swelled his head or stopped his thinking machinery.

Nothing is gained by ignoring the facts. Statements that there are no strikes only tend to create a lack of confidence in those making them, for the people know better. Whatever signs of repentance, promises of good conduct there may be from certain labor leaders, the strikes still continue, as note the following from the United States News dated March 27, 1942:

STRIKES

Thirty-one strikes, slow-downs, and other disputes which held up industrial production were reported in Washington last week. More than 9,394 employees were involved.

The number of strikes represents an all-time peak since this country became involved in war, December 7.

The totals:

Eighteen American Federation of Labor strikes, involving more than 5,268 employees
Eleven Congress of Industrial Organizations strikes, involving more than 4,050 employees.

One independent union strike, involving 50 employees.

One strike of 26 employees, involving no union.

In the list below the figures are the approximate number of employees involved in each strike.

INVOLVING AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR UNIONS

Building trades: Aluminum Co. of America, Mobile, Ala., 850; defense housing project, Wentzville, Mo.; Ford bomber plant, Willow Run, Mich.; J. L. Williams & Sons, Sheridan, Ark., 275; Kurz-Root Co., Appleton, Wis.; Pendleton Lahdy shipyard, New Orleans, La., 75.

Electrical workers: Fisher-Memphis Aircraft Division, Memphis, Tenn.

Garment workers: Cosmopolitan Manufacturing Co., Cambridge, Mass., 200; Leon Bros., Los Angeles, Calif., 80; Schwarzbach-Heber Co., New York, N. Y., 1,500.

Metal trades: Fisher Tank Arsenal, Grand Blanche, Mich., 8; Marion Malleable Iron Works, Marion, Ind., 680; Todd-California Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif., 1,000; Walker Electrical Co., Atlanta, 100.

Potters: U. S. Stonewear Co., Tallmadge, Ohio.

Pulp & Papermill Workers: Sealright Corporation, Fulton, N. Y., 200.

Miscellaneous: Armstrong Cork Co., Braintree, Mass., 300; Consolidated Molded Products Co., Scranton, Pa.

INVOLVING CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS' UNIONS

Auto workers: Hydraulic Devices, Inc., Detroit, Mich.*; National Stamping Co., Detroit, 730*; Thorrez-Maes Manufacturing Co., Jackson, Mich., 600*; Universal Products Co., Dearborn, Mich., 600.

Clothing workers: Crescent City Laundries, Inc., New Orleans, La., 1,400.

Mill & Smelter Workers: Aluminum Co. of America, Cleveland.*

Rubber Workers: Seiberling Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

Steel workers: Atlas Press, Kalamazoo, Mich.*; Matthews Manufacturing Co., Worcester, 350; P. Wall Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., 220; Republic Steel Corporation, Niles, Ohio, 150.

INVOLVING INDEPENDENT UNIONS

Morrison Products Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio, 50—Mechanics Educational Society of America.

INVOLVING NO UNION

Ansin Shoe Co., Athol, Mass., 26.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

INTELLIGENT CENSORSHIP VERSUS CENSORSHIP

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the people of America want to believe most of the things they read. They want to know that the dispatches they read, date-lined "Washington, D. C.," tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. We know that information from Tokyo, from Berlin, from Rome, is often deliberately designed to conceal and distort the truth. It is our pride that our Government does not need to hide

*Indicate the slow-downs

bad news from the American public. When we read an official denial by Nazi Germany, we instinctively believe that the story is true. It must be the job of American censorship to see that this does not happen here.

The people of America want to win this war in the quickest possible time. We want to do everything necessary, and everything possible to achieve this result. Our Nation understands the importance and the significance of producing military equipment and getting it into action at the earliest moment. We have scarcely begun to grasp the importance and the significance of words in this tremendous conflict.

Americans are inclined to get tired of mere talk. We believe in action. Deliver the goods and stop talking so much about it, is what we want. So far as we are concerned, the ideological conversations which have ripped Europe and Asia apart are not vital to our being. We believe in our democracy and the struggles of the "isms." Fascism, nazi-ism, and communism in other lands are of real concern to only small parts of our population.

All this has led to an almost instinctive dislike of such new elements of modern warfare as propaganda and censorship. We know that in many nations every line of information is blue-penciled. We know that every word sent from other countries has been dictated by a controlled agency.

But we do not know ourselves the importance of these weapons. We do not recognize that a goodly part of this war is a battle of words. Words are fighting battles in China, in India, throughout the continents of Europe and Asia. Battles may not be won with them alone, but many a battle has been lost because of their influence.

Our Government has embarked upon a program of censorship. For some 2 months now, Byron Price, a newspaperman, has been carrying on bravely as chief of our censorship. But despite his efforts, the American people continue to be mystified. When censorship was first begun by Mr. Price, it seemed perfectly acceptable. The basic rules for our newspapers were clean and simple. Naturally, we were not to print anything which might furnish aid and comfort to the enemy. Troop movements, shipping news, technical details of new weapons, maps describing the location of ammunition dumps—all of these things were so obviously matters of military consequence that no one raised a word of objection.

What has happened has been almost incomprehensible. When our soldiers arrived in North Ireland, that news was proclaimed to the world. It was good news, news for which many of us had been waiting expectantly. But it required something like painful surgery to dig out the information that our boys came from the Middle West. For some reason the Army seemed to believe that this was a military secret. Just how it would help the Nazis, Japs, or Italians to know that our North Ireland boys came from Ohio, or Indiana, or Illinois is not very clear.

But this is only a sample of the kind of censorship which is driving American newspaper correspondents into premature senility. Our Army Procurement Division recently turned thumbs down on a request for permission to print information dealing with new aircraft factories. Within a few hours from the refusal, a Washington official gave out the entire story personally. Information dealing with the details of war production was rigidly withheld from the representatives of the press in Washington for weeks. A military service journal proceeded to publish the whole story in specific terms without batting a type stick.

Mr. Price has told us that the censorship program is being enforced entirely through the voluntary cooperation of our publishers, but the Army has threatened to use the 1917 Espionage Act to enforce its views on what may and what may not be printed.

Perhaps the censorship problem is only one more manifestation of the confusion which prevails throughout our high command in Washington. The recent statement of Secretary of the Navy Knox to the effect that Los Angeles had been frightened half out of its wits by non-existent planes followed almost immediately by Secretary of War Stimson's insistence that unidentified commercial aircraft had flown on a reconnaissance flight over California which was followed in turn by denials that such a flight was even remotely possible, bear out the point. Then, too, the amazing story of a convoy en route to Australia which blasted its way onto our front pages scarcely reflects an intelligent use of our censorship.

Almost incredible as it may seem, the British censorship, after 2½ years of vicious warfare, is recognized everywhere as far less inclusive than our own. The British press has printed news of American aviation developments which were withheld from our own people.

But for a classic example of confusion worse confounded, the last 3 weeks have been unprecedented. The Secretary of War blandly informed us that material reinforcements had been dispatched to the defense of Java while the fighting was still at its height on that strategic island. A few days later the Japanese declared that some 5,000 British and Americans had been captured when Batavia's defenses failed. To this charge our newspapers printed the indirect rebuttal that only 600 Americans had been in Java and all of these were attached to our air force.

On Saturday morning, March 7, 1942, the London Daily Mail printed a dispatch dealing with American convoys to Australia and unparalleled battles in the Pacific under the byline of its correspondent, Walter Farr. According to the story, it was dispatched "aboard an American warship at sea." From London and Melbourne, Australia, this story was cabled to American newspapers.

Secretary of the Navy Knox immediately denied that the dispatch had been filed from an American warship. On Sunday the Navy Department declared that Farr had filed his report from Hono-

lulu and then went on to say that the story had "no factual information about movements to Australia which had not been published by the American press prior to the London Mail publication." Where had this story appeared before?

These curious word battles have lent heat rather than light to the censorship picture. The Secretary of War believed that the route of the Alaskan Highway is a military secret. The Canadian Government at Ottawa promptly published the entire business. Our American censors banned all references to the building of a new American naval base in Eritrea, Africa. The British Government announced it and British censors O. K.'d its publication. President Roosevelt immediately denounced the release of the information.

All this confusion is a serious threat to every American publication which regards itself as a responsible organ of information. Too much news which offers neither aid nor comfort to the enemy is being blacked out for utterly incomprehensible reasons. Nothing is gained by these tactics, but much that we regard as valuable and meaningful in our lives is challenged needlessly.

We must have censorship in wartime. Let that censorship be consistent. Let it be intelligent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

CHAMBER HITS AT STRIKES IN WAR PLANTS—ASKS MEMBERS TO DEMAND FEDERAL ACTION

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, an article appearing in the Salt Lake Tribune with the heading "Chamber hits strikes in war plants." This will be my reply to the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce to its executive secretary, Gus P. Backman:

I note by a news item in the Salt Lake Tribune that you had sent notices to all members of your organization to "demand legislation prohibiting strikes, dispensing with the closed shop, and cleaning up the labor rackets."

Well, the boys on Main Street have responded moderately, but have disregarded the strike and cleansing process; but all want to repeal the 40-hour week, and time and a half for overtime. I suppose they overlooked strikes at this time because strikes in war industry are almost nonexistent, according to the War Production Board.

This sort of propaganda is of the supposedly now defunct and discredited America First Committee type, and I recognize some familiar names of individuals who were fighting the defense program and the protection of the United States prior to Pearl Harbor, now posing as superpatriots, many of whom would risk the losing of the war if they could but discredit the President and destroy labor—whether or not it is loyal, patriotic labor.

Some of your members suggest that perhaps I might serve in the armed forces at \$21 a month. As a matter of fact, I did exactly that in the last war, for which I am proud as all you must be who had that experience, therefore I neither yield to you nor any organization in the matter

of patriotism. I am greatly disturbed when I think of what these fine soldiers will have to meet, but I am sure that their patriotism and service will be no less whether they get \$21 per month or \$221 per month. This is the real test of love of country, this is their moment of history—the connecting link of a hopeful future with a glorious past.

It is my opinion your organization is using the patriotism of young men, and the anguish of the mothers of these men, to gain a long cherished selfish end, namely, discredit the administration and humble the laborers, at a time when the War Production Board, with the Army and Navy, is working with success to smooth out problems with management and labor in a democratic way, and to correct some of the things that have long needed correcting. Now the labor haters are fearful this plan will succeed, hence their unjust and un-American activities at this critical time.

During the debate on our foreign policy prior to the Pearl Harbor affair, I was never quite sure of the right thing to do. But when I considered the insight and unlimited information of those in high and responsible positions, I felt they were in a better position to know the best course to take, and I therefore thought it wise to follow their leadership. I did this over the screaming protests of propaganda similar to this put out by your organization now. In view of the fact that the leadership was dead right then, and the critics were wrong, there is no reason why I should follow the critics at this time—and I do not intend to do so.

The President of these United States, the Chief of the War Production Board, the War and Navy Departments, and responsible labor organization leaders, agree that tremendous production has been realized and that maximum production can be had without spite legislation directed at either management or labor. Let labor and management not become involved in quarrels at this time, when our very existence as a great free Nation might be impaired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH].

BONNEVILLE—ALUMINUM PRODUCTION

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to urge that the committee's recommendation on Bonneville appropriations be accepted, as to do otherwise will seriously interfere with the very foundation of our supply program.

It may be recalled that I offered the first Bonneville bill in 1937, and have for the last 10 years been a member of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee which has considered all basic Bonneville legislation.

The Washington side of the Bonneville Dam is in my district, and as a result of the availability of this low-priced abundant power, my district is now making perhaps the largest contribution to the base-metal requirements of the air program of any district in the country. I can speak, therefore, with a considerable degree of intimate knowledge on this

subject. Because of this experience, I wish to point out the salient facts as to aluminum production and the part that this production plays in our air program.

Aluminum production

In 1929 the primary production of the virgin aluminum in the United States totaled 222,000,000 pounds. Today two plants in my district are actually producing at the annual rate of around 240,000,000 pounds, or in excess of the total American production in 1929.

In 1939 the primary aluminum production in the United States had risen to 287,000,000 pounds. In 1940 when the National Defense Advisory Committee assumed responsibility for the metals program, their first goal was 400,000,000 pounds per year, which was to be gained by the new plant at Vancouver, Wash., and the expansion of the plants at Alcoa, Tenn., Massena, N. Y., and Baden, N. C.

You will remember the early controversy over the supply of aluminum and the war requirements. Between June 1941 and today we find that the Army and Navy requirements as to aluminum have been gradually but increasingly raised. In January 1941 the requirements were set around 600,000,000 pounds, and in May 1941, when Mr. Batt appeared before the Truman committee he admitted that the requirement level had been raised to one billion and later to one and a half billion pounds per year. We now find that within the last 2 months the aluminum requirement level has been raised to 2,200,000,000 pounds.

The advance in the amount of the metal requirement for airplane production is significant, and brings out the power requirements of the President's expanded program. It takes approximately 1 kilowatt working continuously for a year to produce a thousand pounds of aluminum or magnesium. A heavy bomber requires about 24,000 pounds of light metal per plane, the smallest bomber 16,000 pounds, a pursuit plane, 10,000 pounds, and a trainer plane about 6,000 pounds of light metal, such as aluminum and magnesium. The average bomber, therefore, requires about 20,000 pounds of light metal.

The President's annual message to Congress last January set a new goal for our national supreme resources mobilization effort. In this message he ordained that immediate steps were going to be taken to increase the production rate of airplanes from fifty to one hundred and twenty-five thousand per year.

Northwest aluminum production

The Aluminum Co. of America's plant at Vancouver, Wash., located in the third Washington congressional district, is now producing at the rate of 180,000,000 pounds of ingot aluminum per year with the electrical demand of 178,500 kilowatts. This plant was energized on August 31, 1940. The Reynolds metal plant located at Longview, Wash., has an annual capacity of 62,225,000 pounds of aluminum per year. This plant was energized on September 11, 1941. In addition to these two going plants, there is a new plant under construction at Troutdale, Oreg., with a capacity of 96,000,000

pounds per year and using 105,000 kilowatts. This plant is scheduled for completion on May 1 of this year. There is a fourth ingot aluminum plant under construction at Tacoma, Wash., with a capacity of forty-one and a half million pounds per year and an electrical demand of 46,000 kilowatts, which is scheduled for completion on August 1, 1942. The fifth ingot plant is under way at Spokane, Wash., scheduled for completion in May 1942. The Spokane plant will have a capacity of 123,000,000 pounds with an electrical demand of 130,000 kilowatts. Therefore, present northwest ingot aluminum plants will be producing in the middle of this year around 508,000,000 pounds or about one-half of the present production and around one-quarter of the ultimate production. About 520,000 kilowatts of Columbia River power will be at work on aluminum production this year. This production rate is equivalent to 50,000 pursuit planes, 21,000 large bombers, and 32,000 average bombers per year. These rounded figures will give to this House an idea of the contribution being made by Columbia River power to the defense program.

Defense metals

It is becoming obvious that this country must be the principal supply source of the nations combating the Axis Powers, and in this supply, electric power will be a large factor in the production effort. Modern machines needed for warfare are built of high-quality, lightweight, and high-strength material. Such materials can only be produced in the electrical furnace or in the electric cell.

The program

In his message to Congress, the President announced his plan of increasing airplane production from 50 to 125,000 per year, tank production from 45 to 75,000 per year, antiaircraft guns from 20 to 35,000, and merchant ship tonnage from 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 tons; all of these rates to be realized by 1943. With this production rate applied to the major implements of war, it will be necessary that other rates be increased proportionately. Therefore, this involves large increases in the production of metals and raw materials like steel, aluminum, magnesium, copper, tin, zinc, synthetic rubber, and chrome in amounts much larger than previously contemplated. In all of this production electric power is the base of the program.

Defense dollars per kilowatt hour

The basis of the power requirements for the defense program has been estimated by various agencies from 2.25 to 3.5 kilowatt-hours per dollar of defense expenditure. The tentative figure of the War Production Board is now around 2.25 kilowatt-hours per dollar, whereas the Federal Power Commission estimated 2.75 and the Brookings Institution 3.5 kilowatt-hours. This means that one kilowatt working every hour in the year will turn out from \$2,500 to \$4,000 worth of defense metals. The total annual expenditure for war of \$72,000,000,000 represents about \$55,000,000,000 of defense production with an estimated power requirement of about 17,000,000 kilowatts

on the basis of the lowest estimates presented. The higher estimates would be 50 percent in excess of this figure. This electrical requirement in the next 18 months must be met in two ways. First, by new capacity, and secondly, by displacement and curtailment. It is, therefore, apparent that this Nation must bring into service every kilowatt that can be quickly and expeditiously obtained within the next 2 years.

Columbia power source

The four Bonneville units totaling 216,000 kilowatts, which capacity has not been included in any of the production figures I have previously given, will come into service in the early part of 1943. This is the quickest and best power obtainable in America for the defense effort. In addition three Coulee units totaling in excess of 300,000 kilowatts will also come into production in 1943. Therefore, next year two Columbia River plants will be able to make an additional defense contribution in excess of a half million kilowatts. I now predict that all of this capacity and more will be needed in the victory program. The appropriation which is now before you is for the purpose of carrying this power to the point where it will be turned into the implements of victory. This House cannot afford at this time to disturb the figures submitted by the committee.

Plant locations and how the energy will be utilized is beyond the control of the Bonneville Power Administration. For strategic and other reasons, with which some of us do not always agree, these plants are set by the military authorities. When these locations are set it is incumbent upon the Bonneville administrator to transmit and transform the power from the generating source to the point of use. It is impossible to tie this appropriation down to specific items when the rapidly changing military situation may require the shift of large blocks of power on very short notice.

Checks and balances

The actual expenditure of this money will be controlled by two checking agencies. The first of these is the War Production Board, which will control the allocation of the basic materials used in line and substation construction. This agency will not grant priorities for any construction not used in the war program. In addition, the Bureau of the Budget has a control over the release of these funds, and the funds will not be released except for defense activities. Plant locations are more or less on wheels because of the raw material and military situation; therefore, of necessity, flexibility is required in the allocation of funds. Some of us may not agree with the individual items which make up this estimate. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the total sum will be needed in the fiscal year 1943 to take the new power to the point of use. Therefore, I again urge that this body carefully weigh the facts so as to avoid any decision that could impede the flow of this electric current into quick and needed war production.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

HETCH HETCHY POWER FOR ALUMINUM PRODUCTION

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill before the Committee includes a small sum for the Division of Power in the office of the Secretary of the Interior. It is to support this item that I have asked recognition.

Largely through the work of this Division, a giant, new aluminum plant—which will produce almost 100,000,000 pounds of aluminum annually—will soon be producing this vital war metal in Stanislaus County, Calif., near Modesto. This plant will use power generated at the great Hetch Hetchy development which is owned and operated by the city of San Francisco. The project was made possible by the Raker Act passed by the Congress in 1913. This act required that the power generated at Hetch Hetchy be sold directly to consumers.

Ever since the first kilowatt-hour of energy was generated at Hetch Hetchy, there has been controversy over the method of selling this power. In 1940, the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the city was selling the power in violation of law. The result of the Court's decision was that the powerhouse would have to be closed down on July 1 of this year unless some means could be found of selling the power directly to consumers.

Instead of letting the ax fall and allowing this power to be shut off by operation of law at a time when it is critically needed, the Division of Power in the office of the Secretary of the Interior set to work to find a means of compliance with the Raker Act which would be beneficial to the city of San Francisco and would further the war effort. I know that this was a tremendous job, a job of real difficulty, because I have myself been in consultation since the inception of the program with the Federal officials who had jurisdiction over the matter. The men in the Division of Power were able to work out an arrangement by which Hetch Hetchy power could be supplied to a new aluminum plant to be located near Modesto.

This great achievement will mean a lot to the people of my district; it will mean revenues to the people of San Francisco and a decreased tax burden; and it will mean more fighting planes and bombers to our forces in Australia, the Philippines, and throughout the world. I think that this achievement of the Division of Power, standing alone, would more than justify its small appropriation which has been approved by the committee. I sincerely trust that it will be approved by this body as a vital national defense item.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

WAR VETERANS ARE DOING THEIR FULL PART IN PRESENT CRISIS AND DESIRE FURTHER SERVICE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I invite the attention of all of you, but particularly the attention of our membership which serves on the House Military Affairs and also the House Naval Affairs Committees. I have received an unprecedented number of letters from World War veterans who

are now desirous of again serving with our armed forces. Many of these World War No. 1 veterans have spoken to me personally concerning their desire to be of helpfulness and service during the present war. Of course, some of them are in the Officers' Reserve Corps and in this manner have been able to go into active duty and a few others have in the regular routine gained admittance to the Army and Navy. I have also had quite a few communications from Spanish-American War veterans who feel they are physically able to resume service with the armed forces. These veterans desire to serve our country in some helpful capacity.

I believe that the Congress should promptly enact a general law which will permit all veterans who are able to meet reasonable requirements to enter the armed forces. Their World War and Spanish-American War training and their civilian occupation and experience since the war have prepared them for most useful services. Thousands of them have been engaged since the last war in the professional world or in administrative and directory capacities or in skilled labor capacities, and in fact, all of them who are physically able to follow gainful employment have been active in some qualifying line of work which renders them now by far of greater usefulness to the armed forces than an inexperienced man. It is true that a relatively small number may be physically able to endure exacting combat duty but with their knowledge, training, and experience, they could very well be offered service with the forces primarily in noncombat capacity. They could train and whip into Army shape the thousands of men now entering the armed forces; they could do clerical duty, administrative duty, police and guard duty, construction supervising duty, transportation, and mobilization supervision, production and supervision duty, and in fact, there are numbers of assignments which could be better performed by them than by any new person in the armed forces, and such assignments would be within the physical ability of a large percentage, particularly of the World War veterans.

Practically all of these veterans have dependent families and many of them are without income except from their own earnings. It would be necessary for reasonable and comparable compensation to be allowed them. In other words, practically every one of these veterans could qualify for capacities which ordinarily require officer's rank and pay. If such capacity should be in noncombat duty, then a scale of pay, perhaps under regular officer's pay, could be arranged for special veterans' officers corps. Recently, I sent the following communication to the President:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 3, 1942.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I strongly urge that further consideration be given to the utilization of World War veterans in the present war program. Many of the war veterans are in good physical condition, and an unusually large percentage of them have sufficient health to enable them to perform some kind of useful service during the war program. They are tried, true and patriotic men and are, indeed, well experienced in

practically all problems now facing our war-program officials.

Those who are not physically capable of active combat service could be utilized in active duty as camp officials, intelligence officers, in training of draftees and new recruits, and in guard duty. An arrangement of this kind would relieve many younger men in other services and would increase the number of existing trained officers for more active duty.

Practically all of these veterans have families and other responsibilities which would make it, in nearly all cases, imperative for them to have greater pay than that allowed privates. It would be my thought that a special and appropriate officership arrangement might be well worked out which would allow commissions to practically all war veterans whose services are utilized as outlined above. The grade of pay allowed for the respective commissions given veterans could be slightly under the scale of the existing regular Army officers' pay.

A veteran who served as a private in World War No. 1 undoubtedly could now be worth far more to our armed forces at this time than he was during his war service, this because of his World War No. 1 training and experience and his civilian service and utilization since World War No. 1. A reasonable pay scale especially arranged for and provided for such war veterans who now enter the service for special duty and for the duration of the war would enable the minimum maintenance of their homes and at the same time permit them to fulfill their heart's desire for service now with our armed forces.

Of course it is my thought that enlistment for such service should be optional with the veteran. An arrangement, however, as indicated above, would successfully invite the service of thousands of war veterans, and their service would be of inestimable value to our armed forces and our Nation's security.

I receive letters daily from patriotic veterans who feel that they are physically able to perform at least some reasonable assignment in the role of our country's defense. Practically all of them prefer assignment in accordance with their physical ability directly in the armed forces of our country.

I make this suggestion to you as the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, and with the hope that some worth-while plan may evolve which will be not only for the help of our war veterans but also for substantial aid to our armed forces in the defense of our country.

With very kind personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

LEX GREEN.

Mr. Chairman, in our appropriate committees will give consideration to constructive and reasonable legislation along this line, a surprising number of worthy and capable veterans will thus be invited to return to the service. In fact, an unduly large percentage are now clamoring for enrollment, even for unpaid duty. I hope favorable consideration can be had.

DISABILITY ALLOWANCE AND INCREASES

At this particular time, when industry has been seriously displaced by war necessity and when the cost of living has increased, it would seem most timely to me for the House to give consideration to general pension legislation for World War veterans. I have during the past several Congresses introduced legislation for this purpose. H. R. 1440, which I introduced for this purpose, is now before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Under the provisions of this bill, disability pay would be as fol-

lows: Ten percent, \$12 per month; 25 percent, \$20 per month; 50 percent, \$30 per month; 75 percent, \$40 per month; total disability, \$60 per month. The bill further provides that World War veterans and dependents who are now drawing compensation would have an automatic increase of 10 percent in such payments. There are other provisions in the bill for liberalization of existing laws. I have in my files a large number of veteran cases which I believe in fact are service connected but from one cause or another, the veteran has been unable to prove to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Administration that service connection exists. This bill would take care of all these border-line cases by automatically giving compensation.

WIDOWS' AND ORPHANS' BILL

In this connection, I may mention that we have twice passed in the House and sent to the Senate a bill for compensation benefits for dependents of World War veterans without service connection. Our last bill was H. R. 4, and passed the House on June 16, 1941. This is one of the most meritorious pieces of legislation that I ever voted for, and I hope that the other legislative branch will promptly act in order that these

widows and orphans and dependent parents of deceased veterans may have these justified benefits.

It is true that the Congress has made large appropriations for disabled World War veterans and for their dependents and for their hospitalization. In my State we now have some 4,000 Spanish-American War veterans who draw pension and some 11,500 World War veterans drawing compensation or pension. The total amount paid for all purposes to all veterans, dependents, for hospitalization, and so forth, in Florida for 1941, was a little over \$11,000,000. I include herewith in this connection a statement recently given me by the Veterans' Administration.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 11, 1942.

HON. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GREEN: Reference is made to your letter dated February 9, 1942, requesting information relative to the amount disbursed in the State of Florida for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941.

The following table indicates an approximate distribution of expenditures in the State of Florida during the fiscal years 1940 and 1941, and the number of beneficiaries on the roll June 30, 1940 and 1941.

	Number on roll June 30, 1940	Disbursed during fiscal year 1940	Number on roll June 30, 1941	Disbursed during fiscal year 1941
Compensation and pension benefits:				
World War:				
Living veterans.....	6,582	\$3,428,752	7,127	\$3,822,002
Deceased veterans.....	1,794	973,481	1,953	1,034,798
War of 1812.....				
Mexican War (deceased veterans).....	4	2,368	4	2,371
Indian War:				
Living veterans.....	35	30,245	40	28,843
Deceased veterans.....	50	14,411	47	17,082
Civil War:				
Living veterans.....	37	56,128	27	33,554
Deceased veterans.....	603	290,032	534	256,094
Spanish American War:				
Living veterans.....	3,930	3,058,047	3,904	3,207,359
Deceased veterans.....	1,014	267,809	1,086	403,787
Regular Establishment:				
Living veterans.....	659	227,864	663	289,104
Deceased veterans.....	182	54,582	204	62,904
Total compensation and pension benefits:				
Living veterans.....	11,243	6,801,036	11,791	7,380,862
Deceased veterans.....	3,647	1,702,683	3,828	1,777,096
Military and naval insurance.....	378	313,064	325	256,641
Adjusted service and dependent pay.....		12,661		8,318
Administration ¹		1,479,267		1,581,544
Construction.....		400,559		91,792
Total disbursements.....		10,709,270		11,096,253

¹ Administration includes expenditures incident to the maintenance and operation of all offices, hospitals, and all forms of medical, hospital, and domiciliary care.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

These expenditures do not take care of the pressing and just requirements. Passage of H. R. 1440 or its substance is not only justified but is just and should be done. I ask your support for this bill.

For all purposes, veterans and dependents, hospitalization, and so forth, in Florida the past 12 years, there has been expended possibly \$84,000,000. We have in Florida two splendid facilities for veterans—one at Lake City and the other at Bay Pines, Fla. In my efforts for these facilities, I have uniformly had the fullest cooperation of Florida veterans. In fact, this cooperation has been had in all things which were for the benefit and

betterment of our great Nation and our democratic form of government. I am grateful for this cooperation and understanding which exists in my State.

VOTED FOR BONUS PAYMENTS

Soon after my vote for payment of the bonus, Frank E. Altman, senior vice commander, Department of Florida, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and also president, Veterans' Voting League, wired me:

Your vote yesterday (for bonus payment) has been recorded in our sacred archives. Call on me or our State-wide organization for anything you may need in future.

Also, J. J. Skillman, national councilman, Veterans of Foreign Wars, wired as follows:

Congratulations on the courage of your conviction to honor the Nation's heroes by

your support in voting for the bonus bill. The veterans of the State of Florida will never forget your courage and gratitude shown to them by you.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, 1936, roll call No. 3, shows that I voted to pass the bonus bill. I also was the only Florida Congressman who signed the petition on the Speaker's desk to force consideration of this bill. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1936, page 987, roll call No. 11, shows that I voted to pass the bonus bill over the veto of the President. This is the bill under which the bonus was paid to the veterans.

Gordon B. Knowles, former commander, the American Legion, Department of Florida, wrote me as follows:

I wish to express to you on behalf of the American Legion, of the Department of Florida, and particularly on behalf of my associates on the committee that recently went to Washington about the Lake City Hospital, our very sincere thanks for your co-operation and kindness in connection with the project and our visit to Washington. You were more than courteous, thoughtful, and hospitable to us and we are all very grateful.

Hon. Frank J. Wideman, former Assistant Attorney General, wrote me as follows:

I congratulate you on your good work in the matter of establishing a branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers in Florida.

Raymer F. Maguire, former member of Florida Board of Control, wrote me:

I appreciate the Fletcher-Green bill providing for the establishment of National Home for Disabled Soldiers in Florida. I am sure of one thing, and that is that you never miss an opportunity to put in your oar and paddle for the interest of Florida.

Howard Rowton, a most prominent Florida Legionnaire, wrote me:

I want to thank you for the fine support that you have always given the ex-service men of Florida, and we feel that in you we have a real friend.

J. W. Gooding, past department commander, Florida United Spanish War Veterans, wrote me:

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for the good work you have done for the State of Florida in reference to the branch of the National Soldiers Home for Florida (Southern States) and for your wires to me as department commander. I especially wish to thank you for all your work in behalf of our organization, the United Spanish War Veterans. As retiring department commander for Florida for 1929-30 I personally as well as for the organization express my appreciation.

The great veterans' facility now at Bay Pines, Fla., was established as a result of the bill which I introduced in the House and the late Senator Fletcher, of Florida, in the Senate.

LEGION DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

One of the greatest honors which it has been my lot to receive was the Legion distinguished service award for 1933, of the American Legion post of my home county.

If there is doubt in the minds of any present as to the patriotism and desire of World War veterans to serve our country in the present armed conflict, I hope you

will listen to the following communication:

UNITED STATES AMERICAN LEGION,
St. Petersburg, Fla., March 6, 1942.

HON. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEX: Your letter of the 20th ultimo, enclosing the copy of the American's Creed, was read to the entire membership in open meeting, and a motion was made and passed that this letter be sent expressing our sincere appreciation.

Many of our members have expressed their desire to again serve our country in this hour of need, but apparently their age prohibits the use of their services. However, we all stand ready and willing to serve in whatever capacity possible.

Personally, I took an examination for re-commission in the service on January 13 and have just been ordered to have my blood pressure rechecked, although I haven't missed a day from the office in many years.

Assuring you it is always a pleasure to be of service and with kindest personal regards, I am

Respectfully,

MARTIN H. TEWES,
Adjutant.

I was deeply impressed by a statement recently carried in the Florida press and made by State Commander Rupert Caviness, of the American Legion, Department of Florida. Mr. Caviness is a highly patriotic, thoughtful, and well-informed gentleman. His views are indeed entitled to the consideration of the Congress. His statement, in part, was as follows:

In my opinion, we are very fortunate in having the brainiest men of the world at the head of our Army and our Navy. Our Army and Navy represent the "cream of manpower" not only of our Nation but of the whole world.

I have all of the confidence in the world in these men, and I know that they are capable of doing a better job than is possible by any other manpower of the world, providing they are furnished with a sufficient amount of the proper equipment.

The United States Army and Navy is composed of the highest quality men that can be found in the world. They are in there because of the enlistment, or because of selective service. We should be doing things to let these men know that we are proud of them. Our task is to build their spirits and try to make them believe that we are with them 100 percent.

The quickest way for us to win this war would be for every true American citizen to be called into some kind of service and thereby carry his or her part.

Suppose we take another idea from Britain and put a ceiling on the amount of money that every United States citizen may earn in a year. Is any civilian worth more pay than the man who is fighting and offering his life to preserve what we have?

The veterans are responding nobly to the call of duty and are doing all within their power for our war effort. They desire to participate further. If arrangements can be made for further participation, the veterans will be not only happy but will respond and our civilization will be benefited.

We are now facing the most critical period in the history of our Republic. Civilization is at the very cross roads. The liberty and freedom of not only the American people but of mankind is at stake. The suppressed and enslaved people of many nations now look with long-

ing hope for rescue by the people of the United States. Their freedom has been blasted. They are now writhing under the iron heel of Hitler and his hordes. Unity and supreme effort of America are the only hope for freedom's victory over Germany, Italy, and imperial Japan. Men of character, experience, and ability are needed to help guide the destiny of our Nation and world freedom. Let us do all possible to utilize the services of these patriotic and qualified veterans.

The Clerk read to line 6, bottom of page 1.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. McCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6845 and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and include two or three short letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very excellent address by the Commissioner from the Philippine Islands [Mr. ELIZALDE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a speech by Mrs. Pearl Buck.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an item from the New England News Letter for the month of March.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION OF THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4579) to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill affects the Walsh-Healey Act?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman explain what the changes are and whether the bill has the support of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] and those who represent organized labor as well as the others who are

vitaly interested in this type of legislation in the House.

Mr. HOBBES. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to answer the gentleman's question. This bill brings the Walsh-Healey Act into line with the Fair Labor Standards Act, and makes the two in accord with respect to annual wages and hours. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan is one of the ranking members of our committee as well as in the leadership of the minority of the House, knows that this bill has the unanimous favorable reports, both of the subcommittee and the full Committee on the Judiciary. It has the cordial support of Mr. HEALEY, who is one of the joint authors of the Walsh-Healey Act. It has the support of L. Metcalfe Walling, who was the administrator of the Walsh-Healey Act and now is the Wage and Hour Administrator.

So far as our committee is advised, no one opposes it, and it has the hearty approval of everyone who has studied the problem it solves.

There are a few employers who have agreed with their employees, bargaining collectively, upon an annual income for working not more than 2,080 hours annually, as permitted by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Such firms cannot participate in the war effort on that basis because of the weekly hour maximum fixed by the Walsh-Healey Act. Hence, this bill amends the latter act to make it conform, in this particular, with the former act.

Due to the laudable, intelligent, and diligent efforts of the author of this bill, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the author of an identical bill or a similar bill, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], all of the elements have been brought into accord and there is no opposition whatever so far as we know.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 1 of an act entitled "Public No. 846," Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), be amended by inserting the following proviso after the end of said subsection (c): "Provided, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to any employer who shall have entered into an agreement with his employees pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of subsection (b) of section 7 of an act entitled 'Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.'"

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BOEHNE (at the request of Mr. LUDLOW) for 1 week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.)

the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 25, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, March 25, 1942, on H. R. 6529 and private bills.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold a meeting at 10 a. m. on Friday, March 27, 1942, to hear Mr. Elliot E. Simpson, director of the Drexage Rubber Co. of New York in respect to rubber.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1528. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 6, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Great Pee Dee, Lynchess, Little Pee Dee, and Waccamaw Rivers, S. C., with a view to determining if improvement of Big Bull Creek, with a view to flood control, is advisable, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on October 4, 1940; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1529. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 11, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Nooksack River, Wash., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1530. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 4, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the White River Basin, Mo. and Ark., with a view to determining the advisability of undertaking flood-control works on the Cache River, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on April 14, 1937; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1531. A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Works Agency transmitting a draft of a proposed bill designed to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to appoint a Deputy Federal Works Administrator and to define his duties; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1532. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1533. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a report of the activities

of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries in connection with the defense and war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6845. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1935). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6799. A bill to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war; with amendment (Rept. No. 1944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HART: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1147. A bill for the relief of Dr. Henry Clay Risner; with amendment (Rept. No. 1936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HART: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1280. A bill for the relief of Meta De Rene McLoskey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1336. A bill for the relief of Leah A. Brownell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1578. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and enter judgment on the claim of Carl G. Allgrunn against the United States for the use of his invention in rifling guns during the war and thereafter by the Symington-Anderson Co. at Rochester, N. Y., said invention being shown and described in his Letters Patent No. 1,311,107, issued by the Patent Office of the United States on or about July 22, 1919, and conferring jurisdiction upon said Court of Claims to reopen and further adjudicate the claim of said Carl G. Allgrunn for the use of his invention by companies or in shops other than the Symington-Anderson Co. in 1918 and 1919, which claim has heretofore been settled on the basis of the judgment of the Court of Claims of February 8, 1937, awarding the said Carl G. Allgrunn the sum of \$56,043.76 with interest thereon, on which judgment the said Carl G. Allgrunn was paid on or about April 11, 1938, the sum of \$119,030.80; without amendment (Rept. No. 1939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WORLEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1744. A bill for the relief of Lizzie Berry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1940). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HART: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 2219. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Person; without amendment (Rept. No. 1941). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 3176. A bill for the relief of Agnes Brodahl; with amendment (Rept. No. 1942). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 4624. A bill for the relief of John August Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 6845. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 6846. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN:

H. R. 6847. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. Res. 466. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that activities of the Office of Civilian Defense concerned with the promotion of sports and other forms of recreation should be discontinued immediately; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. DICKSTEIN introduced a bill (H. R. 6848) granting jurisdiction to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to reopen and readjudicate the case of Robert L. Demuth, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2596. Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: Petition of Hon. George Street Boone, of Elkton, Ky., and numerous citizens and residents of Elkton and Todd County, Ky., petitioning for a ceiling over all prices, including wages, agricultural products, manufactured articles, and rents, to be fixed at a reasonable value, with the request that the price ceiling fixed be firmly enforced, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2597. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mrs. H. Francis Meeker and 67 citizens of Clackamas County, State of Oregon, requesting the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2598. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 33 members of the Young People's Organization of the Portersville Presbyterian Church, urging the passage of the bill now before Congress to forbid the sale of beer and liquor in areas where there are training camps for our soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2599. Also, petition of 34 members of the Portersville Presbyterian Church, urging the passage of the bill now before Congress to forbid the sale of beer and liquor in areas where there are training camps for our soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2600. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles, Calif., expressing opposition to the bill H. R. 6750, which is a substitute for both H. R. 6617 and H. R. 6049, contending that the principle of the proposal is not to the best interests of the small communities or local Government agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2601. Also, petition of the California State Board of Agriculture, urging that the Farm Security Administration be granted sufficient budgetary and other support to enable it to provide mobile camps for seasonal workers and to deal with problems of transporting such workers within and to areas where their services are needed, that the United States Employment Service in California be provided with a sufficient additional staff to enable it to perform properly its important functions in connection with recruiting and supplying necessary seasonal labor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2602. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition passed by the Council of the City of bureau of identification of the police department, Corsicana, Tex., favoring House bill 6256; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2603. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution passed by the council of the city of Kenosha, Wis., opposing provisions of House bill 6750, to promote the prosecution of war by exempting from State, Territorial, and local taxes the sale, purchase, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property and services for use in performing defense contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2604. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, at San Francisco, Calif., approving the enactment of House bill 6156, or other appropriate measure, for the purpose of amending section 321 of title III, part II, of the Transportation Act of 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2605. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Pure Milk Association of Chicago, Ill., recommending that no priorities be granted for new public buildings unless it be shown that such buildings are absolutely necessary and will directly aid in winning war; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

2606. Also, resolution of the Pure Milk Association of Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to pass legislation prohibiting interstate shipment and sale of oleomargarine containing any dairy products, which is yellow in color and which imitates butter in respect to color, taste, and appearance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2607. Also, resolution of the Pure Milk Association of Chicago, Ill., urging legislation to protect the human and animal life of the United States by establishing a permanent system of sanitary inspection and control over the importation of animals and their products from foreign countries, and to provide for the imposition of mandatory embargoes against such importation where there is danger of spreading disease to this country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 5, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou Father of our spirits, whose greatness separates Thee not

from us but rather brings Thee near and enfolds us in Thy care: Teach us to live, though sometimes it were easier far to pass away, closing our eyes upon earth's twilight and wakening at the dawn; teach us that harder lesson, how to live and serve Thee in life's darkest moments; to live no more for sin and self, wasting life's precious hours in seeking our own pleasures, but employing heart and hand to do Thy bidding cheerfully, with kindly words for all. And let this be our highest, holiest joy, so to fill the common days with harmonies divine, that, when for us all working days are o'er, the heavenly music, glad some and soothing, sweet and clear, shall rise in purest harmony through all eternity, stealing away the strain of every aching heart, healing the long-borne pain. In our Saviour's name, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GREEN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 24, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4579) to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1057. An act to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees;

H. R. 5945. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin;

H. R. 6738. An act to limit the initial base pay of \$21 per month for enlisted men in the Army and Marine Corps to those of the seventh grade; and

H. R. 6759. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended, so as to permit payment for overtime for Saturday service in lieu of compensatory time.

JAMES D. PRESTON

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in these hectic days of strife and turmoil, it appears to me to be fit and proper to say a few words of appreciation of the loyal and intelligent services of one of the Senate's faithful employees. Today marks the anniversary of 45 years of service of James D. Preston to the Senate.